



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.


We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A 415001



287
1
.2556

1



THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

^
Quarterly Review.

VOL. XLIV.
JULY—DECEMBER.

LONDON:
JOHN AND CHARLES MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
NEW YORK: WILLMER & ROGERS.

1863.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY R. CLAY, SON, AND TAYLOR,
BREAD STREET HILL.

INDEX TO VOL. XLIV.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>A.</p> <p>Aids to Faith [<i>Against Essays and Reviews</i>, &c.], 333—364.</p> | <p>I.</p> <p>Irving [<i>Life of Irving</i>, by Mrs. Oliphant], 291—332.</p> |
| <p>B.</p> <p>Bacon, Francis [<i>Life and Works</i>, &c. edited by Spedding], 388—405.</p> | <p>K.</p> <p>Karslake [see <i>Lord's Prayer</i>].</p> |
| <p>C.</p> <p>Church Congress [see <i>Oxford</i>].</p> | <p>L.</p> <p>Lord's Prayer, Literature of [by Karslake], 43—67.
 Liturgical Quotations from Isapostolic Fathers [<i>Freeman's Divine Service</i>, &c.], 406—440.
 Liturgy, Scottish [see <i>Scottish</i>, &c.].</p> |
| <p>E.</p> <p>Ephraem Rescript [<i>Codex Ephraemi</i>, &c.], 273—290.
 Essays and Reviews:—1. <i>Replies to</i>, by Dr. Gougburn, &c. 2. <i>Aids to Faith</i>, &c.] 68—103.
 Ditto ditto [<i>Postscript</i>, &c. Dr. Lushington's <i>Judgment</i>], 241—248.
 Ditto ditto [see <i>Aids to Faith</i>].</p> | <p>M.</p> <p>Missal [see <i>Sarum</i>].
 Missions, Conference on, held at Liverpool, 253—272.
 Mudry [see <i>French Translations</i>].</p> |
| <p>F.</p> <p>Freeman [<i>Principles of Divine Service</i>] [see <i>Liturgical Quotations</i>, &c.], 1—21.
 French Prayer-Books, Translations, &c. [S.P.C.K.], 1—24.
 Female Life in Prison [see <i>Prison</i>].</p> | <p>O.</p> <p>Oxford, Church Congress at, 1862, 441—502.</p> |
| <p>H.</p> <p>Herbert, George [<i>Works of Herbert</i>, &c.], 103—136.</p> | <p>P.</p> <p>Prison, Female Life in [by a <i>Prison Matron</i>], 365—387.</p> |
| <p>NO. CXVIII.—N.S.</p> | <p>S.</p> <p>Sarum Missal [edited by Forbes], 138—157.
 Scott, on Evil Spirits, 22—42.
 Scottish Liturgy [<i>Publications by Dean Ramsay</i>, &c.], 200—240.
 Surtees Society, Publications of, 158—199.</p> |
| | <p>L L</p> |

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JULY.—Huet's Life of M. Bordas-Demoulin, and Pamphlet on the Solution of the Roman Question—Droz's Histoire du Règne de Louis XVI.—The Bishop of Brechin's Sermon on the Sanctity of Christian Art—Maiden Life, as it is and as it might be—Lathbury's Facts and Fictions of the Biscenary—The Abbé Glaire's French Translation of the New Testament—The Codex Sinaiticus—Cox's Tale of the Great Persian War—Bright's Ancient Collects—Medd's Discourses against Neologian Error—Freeman's Principles of Divine Service.

OCTOBER.—Karslake's Exposition of the Lord's Prayer—Vapereau's Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains—Mrs. Gatty's Aunt Judy's Letters—Melchior's Dream and other Tales, by I. H. G.—M. Peyrat's Histoire et Religion—M. Romée d'Avirey's Un dernier Mot sur Voltaire—Burton's The Book-Hunter—Wey's Gildas, Roman inédit—Masson's Une Couronne d'Épines—Notices of the Abbé Prompsault—Merivale's Latin Version of Hyperion.

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1862.

ART. I.—1. *Courte et simple méthode pour parvenir à une plus parfaite connaissance de la Sainte Cène ; suivie de la préparation nécessairement requise : pour l'avantage des jeunes Communians et de tous ceux qui n'ont pas assez bien réfléchi sur ce Sacrement : avec l'Office pour la Sainte Communion, ainsi que des avis et des instructions, convenables pour y prendre part d'une manière judicieuse et profitable.* Par le Très-Révérend Père en Dieu THOMAS WILSON, D.D. Evêque de Sodor-et-Man. Traduit de l'Anglais par le Rév. J. MUDRY, Ministre de l'Eglise Protest. Episc. Franç. de Lond. Londres : Imprimé aux frais de la Société pour la Propagation des Connaissances Chrétiennes ; et se trouve au Répertoire, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, et au No. 4, Royal Exchange ; et chez tous les Libraires.

2. *Corruptions de l'Eglise de Rome, par rapport au gouvernement ecclésiastique, aux Articles de la Foi, et à la Forme du culte divin : en réponse aux questions de l'Evêque de Meaux.* Par le Très-Rév. GEORGE BULL, D.D. Evêque de St. David. Avec une Préface et des Notes, par le Rév. M. THO. P. PANTIN, M.A. Recteur de Westcote, Comté de Gloucester. Traduit de l'Anglais, et avec une notice sur la vie et les écrits de l'auteur, par le Rév. J. MUDRY, Ministre de l'Eglise Protest. Episcop. Franç. de Londres. Londres : Imprimé aux frais de la Société pour la Propagation des Connaissances Chrétiennes ; et se trouve au Répertoire, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, et No. 4, Royal Exchange ; et chez tous les Libraires.

3. *La Liturgie, ou le Livre des Prières Publiques, et de l'Administration des Sacrements, &c. &c. &c. selon le Rite de l'Eglise Anglicane : contenant en outre le Psautier, ou les Psaumes de David, avec les repos, marqués pour le chant ou la récitation dans l'Eglise ; et ensuite les Offices pour l'Ordination des Diacres et des Prêtres, ainsi que pour le Sacre des Evêques, &c. &c. &c.*

Londres : Imprimé aux frais de la Société pour la Propagation des Connaissances Chrétiennes.

WE purchased copies of the above works, of two of them at least, for the purpose of giving them away. After casting a glance at them, however, we decided upon reviewing them. They are not such works as one can safely put into the hands of an educated Frenchman; they are not such works as ought ever to have been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, considering the high position and character which this Society holds, and its many services to the Church.

We originally intended prefacing our criticisms on these three books by a few observations on what, according to our view, constitutes the chief characteristics of a good translation, illustrating our remarks at the same time by extracts from different translations in different languages; but, after inspecting the versions before us, we soon perceived how such observations, even if want of room did not forbid it, would be out of place in the present paper. With such translations as we have to examine, a short dissertation on the analytical structure of language, or rather on orthography, syntax, and prosody, would be far more appropriate.

French translations may be divided into four categories. There is, in the first place, the close, and, at the same time, free, vigorous, and idiomatic translation, removed alike, as Cowper says in his preface to 'Homer,' 'from stiffness and from wildness,' and of which specimens may be found in Chateaubriand, Guizot, and Villemain, and, we may add, in many of the works of the Anglo-Continental Society. This is the perfect translation. Again, there is the absolutely free and licentious translation, which is exemplified in La Bédollière's version of the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' and in Bonnet's 'Leighton on S. Peter.' Thirdly, there is the falsified and dishonest translation, in which authors are made to say not only what they do not, but the very contradictory of what they do say, and of which we have frequent samples in the *Partie officielle* of the *Moniteur*, and in the famous ultramontanist version of Ranke's 'History of the Popes.' Lastly, there is the clumsy, slovenly, unartistic, ungrammatical translation, full of *tournures embrouillées*, cacologies, and barbarisms, picked up we know not where, but certainly not within the precincts of the French Institute, and of which we have numberless specimens in the books mentioned at the head of this article. This translation is very peculiar; and in offering some remarks upon it, we are desirous, where possible, to dissociate the Society from M. Mudry, the author whom it has been unfortunate enough to employ.

We proceed at once to give specimens of this last species of translation, beginning with the 'Wilson.' This version does not

seem to be made from the authentic edition of Wilson's work, but from the Society's own mutilated reprint of it, which, in spite of repeated remonstrances public and private, continues to be palmed upon the world, and which, in some respects, bears the same resemblance to the genuine 'Wilson,' which M. Mudry's French bears, in all respects, to that of a Nodier or a Villemain. Of course the Epistle Dedicatory is omitted. This is perhaps a fortunate circumstance for M. Mudry. We doubt whether his translation would have proved a great acquisition to French literature.

M. Mudry stumbles at the very threshold. We have given in full the title-page of the French 'Wilson' at the head of this paper, taking scrupulous care not even to omit the translator's name and title; and, as our readers will have perceived, with its 'avis et instructions, convenables pour y prendre part d'une manière judicieuse et profitable,' with its 'Répertoire,' and its incorrect accentuation and punctuation, it is very clumsily put together. The 'Table des divers Articles' which follows, and which is a translation of 'The Contents,' comprises also several blunders, to say nothing of the misprints. Thus M. Mudry speaks of a 'Courte méthode pour parvenir,' instead of 'Méthode à suivre pour parvenir;' of 'Sur le bon propos à former, de mener une vie nouvelle,' instead of 'De la ferme résolution de mener,' &c.; of 'pratiques de Dévotion à exercer,' instead of 'auxquelles on devra se livrer.' We shall place in parallel columns the English of the two first paragraphs in the first section of the Bishop's work, and M. Mudry's translation:—

'There are two holy Ordinances, or Sacraments, appointed by Jesus Christ as most especial means of obtaining grace and salvation; which no Christian who hopes to be saved must wilfully neglect. These are Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

'It must be supposed that you have already been made partakers of one of these two Sacraments: *viz.* that of Baptism, by which you were admitted into the congregation of Christ's flock, were restored to the favour of God, and had the Holy Spirit communicated to you, for a principle of a new and spiritual life; in order to awaken you, and to direct and assist that natural reason, with which God has endued all mankind.'

'Jésus-Christ a institué deux Saintes Ordonnances ou deux Sacrements, comme des moyens très-spécialement établis pour nous obtenir la grâce de Dieu et le salut éternel; ainsi nulle personne qui desire se sauver, ne peut se permettre d'en négliger volontairement les secours. Ce sont le Baptême et la Sainte Cène.

'Il est à supposer que vous avez déjà participé à l'un de ces deux Sacrements: c'est-à-dire, à celui du Baptême, par lequel vous avez été reçu dans la congrégation du troupeau de Christ,—remis en grâce auprès de Dieu,—et enrichi de la communication du Saint Esprit: ce qui doit être pour vous le principe d'une vie spirituelle, toute nouvelle, vous aider à vous réveiller du sommeil; et servir en vous de guide et d'appui à cette raison naturelle dont Dieu s'est plu de douer tout le genre humain.'—P. 1.

The construction of both these paragraphs is vicious, and

the punctuation, like everything else, quite *sui generis*; but they also contain bad grammar and nonsense. '*Congrégation du troupeau de Christ*'! '*S'est plu de douer*'! '*Désire se sauver*'—that is, wishes to *run away*!! Il semblerait que le Chrétien de M. Mudry ne songe qu'à s'enfuir! The reader will perceive there is no expression in the English to give even a colour to the translator's amusing blunder.

Without professing to be first-rate French scholars, we think we can translate at least as well as M. Mudry. We venture to give our own translation, or rather to correct his:—Jésus-Christ a établi deux saintes institutions ou deux Sacrements, qu'il nous a laissés comme des moyens très-spéciaux, destinés à nous obtenir la grâce de Dieu et le salut éternel, et qu'aucun Chrétien qui espère être sauvé ne doit volontairement négliger. Ces Sacrements sont le Baptême et la sainte Cène.

Il est à supposer que vous avez déjà participé à l'un de ces deux Sacrements, c'est-à-dire à celui du Baptême, par lequel vous avez été fait membre du troupeau de Jésus-Christ, remis en grâce auprès de Dieu, et doué du Saint-Esprit, afin qu'il fût en vous le principe d'une vie nouvelle et spirituelle, qu'il vous tirât du sommeil, dirigeât et assistât en vous cette raison naturelle que Dieu a donnée à tous les hommes.

The two next sentences in M. Mudry's translation are not much better French than the two preceding, but we pass them over, and come to the following paragraph:—

'For if you go to the Lord's Supper without considering the reason of that ordinance, and the very great concern you have in it; without seeing the necessity and blessing of a Redeemer; you will go with indifference, and return without such benefit as you might otherwise hope for.'

'Mais si vous *alliez* recevoir la Sainte Cène sans considérer les motifs de cette sainte institution et la grande part que vous y avez—sans voir la nécessité d'un Rédempteur et le bienfait de la rédemption; vous *iriez* avec indifférence, et vous reviendriez sans ces avantages que vous en auriez pu espérer avec de meilleures dispositions.'—P. 2.

We will offer no comment on the undeniable beauties we have italicised in the above, but will again take the liberty of subjoining our own version:—Car si vous participez à la sainte Cène sans être pénétrés des raisons pour lesquelles ce Sacrement a été institué, et de l'intérêt suprême dont il est pour vous; sans concevoir la nécessité d'un Rédempteur ni reconnaître le bienfait de la rédemption, vous recevrez ce Sacrement avec indifférence, et ensuite vous vous retirerez de la Sainte Table, sans y avoir trouvé ces avantages spirituels que vous eussiez pu en espérer, avec de meilleures dispositions.

Perhaps the above complete sentences will be considered sufficient as specimens of the translator's powers. We must, however, give a few isolated expressions. Immediately after

the above, we have 'rentrés en grâce avec Dieu' (p. 3), instead of 'auprès de Dieu'; 'ce qu'ils voyaient juste et droit' (ibid.), instead of 'ce qu'ils jugeaient juste et droit'; 'ainsi que l'Écriture nous en informe' (p. 4), instead of 'nous le dit'; 'ne vivre que pour contracter de mauvaises habitudes' (p. 5), instead of 'pour se livrer à'; 'Dieu avait pourvu dans sa bonté' (ibid.), instead of 'préparé'; 'il a même envoyé son bien-aimé Fils se revêtir' (p. 8), instead of 'afin qu'il se revêtît'; 'ce fut avec cette promesse' (ibid.), instead of 'au moyen de cette promesse'; 'comme il a déjà été observé' (p. 9), instead of 'comme on l'a déjà fait observer'; 'horriblement affreuse' (p. 10)—we need hardly say that there is no equivalent in the original for this delectable trash, which forcibly reminds one of—

'J'aime superbement et magnifiquement :
Ces deux adverbes joints font admirablement'—

'horriblement affreuse,' instead of 'horriblement cruelle'; 'profonde calamité' (ibid.), instead of 'grande calamité'; 'ils tâchent de suivre les règles qu'il leur a prescrites, et qui leur sont absolument nécessaires pour les mettre en état d'entrer dans le ciel et y jouir du bonheur' (pp. 10, 11), instead of 'pour qu'ils puissent être capables d'entrer dans le ciel, et d'y jouir de la félicité.' Many more similar expressions are to be met with in this section, and, indeed, in all the sections, but the above will amply suffice to give an idea of the knowledge of French and philological acquirements of our somewhat adventurous translator. We have passed over many mistakes, *et des plus belles!* In fact, throughout the book, from beginning to end—

'On n'y saurait marcher que sur de belles choses.
Ce sont petits chemins tout parsemés de roses.'

One additional specimen of these *belles choses* we cannot, however, resist the temptation of giving. It is taken from the end of the first section, and admirably illustrates M. Mudry's competency for the task of translator of Bishop Wilson, or of any one else. We will once more place the original and the translation, or caricature rather, side by side:—

'But instead of that, He has been graciously pleased to accept of our sincere though imperfect obedience, and of our sincere repentance, when we have done amiss, and return to our duty.

'Consider this seriously: and you cannot but express your thankfulness after some such manner as this'—

'Mais au lieu de cela, il s'est plu dans sa miséricorde d'accepter de notre part une sincère quoiqu'imparfaite obéissance, et une sincère quoiqu'imparfaite repentance, toutes les fois qu'après être tombés [tombés où ?], nous rentrons dans le devoir.

'Considérez ceci sérieusement: et vous ne pourrez vous empêcher d'exprimer, en quelque sorte, votre reconnaissance de la manière suivante'—

'S'est plu de!' 'Sincère quoiqu'imparfaite obéissance!' 'Considérez ceci!' 'Vous ne pourrez vous empêcher d'exprimer, en quelque sorte!' &c. &c. What fidelity to the English! and what French! Mais c'est du galimatias tout pur! We will once more take the liberty of subjoining another translation:—Mais, au lieu de cela, il a daigné dans sa grande miséricorde accepter notre obéissance sincère quoique imparfaite, et notre repentir véritable, toutes les fois qu'après avoir péché nous rentrons dans le devoir. Considérez sérieusement ces choses, et vous ne pourrez vous empêcher de lui exprimer votre reconnaissance dans les termes suivants ou d'après toute autre formule équivalente.

Our accomplished translator, as the reader has noticed, has a special predilection for 's'est plu de.' The expression again occurs at p. 9. 'Notre Dieu s'est plu dans sa miséricorde d'envoyer.' He is also remarkably fond of the word *diable*, which, without wishing in any way to appear hypercritical or pedantic, we beg to inform M. Mudry, is excessively *familier*, if not positively vulgar. *Démon* is the word ordinarily used. But the whole translation is bald, *lâche*, hazy, un-French, 'horriblement affreuse,' in short; it is full of solecisms and barbarisms, and it is much to be regretted that an institution which in so many ways fairly represents the Church of England as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has been made responsible for it. Throughout, the punctuation is most faulty; throughout, there is scarcely one well-constructed sentence; throughout, it is full of expressions altogether proscribed *par le bon goût*; and as to the actual grammatical blunders, they are as

'Thick as leaves that strew the vales
In Vallombrosa.'

Perhaps it will be said that provided the *fond* of a book is good, the *forme* is a matter of little consideration; that French readers will take up Bishop Wilson's work and read on without stopping to admire the many philological beauties and elegancies scattered in M. Mudry's translation in the most varied profusion; perhaps we may be told, in the language of Martine, whose style, by the way, our translator seems to have taken for model—

'Quand on se fait entendre, on parle toujours bien;
Et tous vos biaux dictons ne servent pas de rien.'

But to this we reply, that it is not always easy to understand M. Mudry; that, whatever may be the intrinsic value of a book, Frenchmen will not read it if it is badly and ungrammatically written; that French taste is extremely fastidious on the score of grammar,¹ exactness, clearness, method, and propriety, and

¹ 'If a French writer of distinction,' says Mr. Breen, in his useful work on *Modern English Literature* (p. 5), 'were to violate any important rule of grammar, the fact

that it is therefore of infinite importance that translations of English works—especially theology, should be put before them in a presentable shape; that the translation before us is not only inelegant, coarse, unintelligible, and essentially corrupt, but also, in some places, irresistibly comic, and that the French have a keen sense of the ludicrous—a sense which we fear would be kept for some time to come in a state of extravagant excitement, should M. Mudry's book unluckily fall into their hands.

'Celui qui ne parle pas clairement,' says the Abbé Mullois, 'ne parle pas Français; car, de sa nature, la langue française est claire, limpide et franche; et la parole obscure n'est vraiment pas une parole française. C'est tudesque, jargon ou patois; mais ce n'est pas la langue du grand peuple franc.'¹

Turn we now to the second book on our list. Like that of its predecessor, its title-page presents some noticeable curiosities; and on it, too, we see announced that it is to be had at the *Répertoire* of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. But, not content with supplying us with a French translation of Bull's 'Corruptions,' the translator has enriched the work with a very remarkable original notice of the Bishop, which is one of the most extraordinary pieces of French composition it has ever been our lot to stumble upon. In this biographical sketch, M. Mudry, whatever may be the case with Bishop Bull, shines with undiminished lustre, or rather with even greater lustre than before. Persons usually compose better than they translate; but this is not the case with our biographer; when compelled to 'shine by his own proper light,' without the thoughts and language of another to guide him, he shines with pre-eminent éclat. We call M. Mudry's biography *French*; but we do so out of pure complaisance and accommodation; it can only be called French on Sganarelle's convenient principle in Molière's 'Médecin malgré lui,' 'Il y a fagots et fagots.' The *Notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits du Docteur G. Bull* is not very long—it only consists of some twenty-five pages; but quantity is compensated by quality, by profound depth and clearness of meaning, and by elaborate elegance of language. We have given our readers specimens of M. Mudry's translations; we will now give them a few extracts, taken, but not selected, from his original compositions. The whole of the *Notice* is a perfect *florilegium*; and our only difficulty is that of deciding upon what to take. We really find ourselves in a veritable *embarras de richesses*.

ἦν γὰρ ἀψωμαί τινος,
τόδ' οὐκ ἐὰ με, παρακαλεῖ δ' ἐκείθεν αὖ——.

¹ 'would be laid hold of immediately by the critics, and laughed at from one end of France to the other.' We know of two or three instances illustrating the truth of this remark. Of course we are not here alluding to M. Mudry.

¹ Cours d'Eloquence Sacrée, p. 144.

We shall therefore begin at the beginning. M. Mudry commences in a very magisterial and self-satisfied way, and with matchless faith in his own powers.

'En plaçant ici une courte notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits du Docteur Bull, je crois donner plus de force à ma traduction, inspirer plus de confiance à mes lecteurs, et rendre un vrai service à ceux d'entre eux, dont ce grand homme n'est pas encore connu. C'est par conséquent le meilleur *passé-port* que je puisse donner à ce petit traité qui est sorti de sa plume, et que j'ai l'honneur d'offrir au public sous les auspices de la langue Française.'—P. 5.

It is evident that the biographer has an inordinately high opinion of his own achievements. We are sorry to disturb his placid self-sufficiency, but we cannot help saying that if he had only written this sentence, it would prove his utter and unrelievable disqualification for the task he has undertaken. We presume that M. Mudry means simply to say that the best recommendation to the 'Corruptions of the Church of Rome' will be an account of the author's life; this is not, however, what his French expresses. He tells us, in the first place, that his translation is deficient in strength—an assertion which we do not feel at all disposed to controvert, but that it will derive strength from the short notice of Bishop Bull prefixed to it—though what his translation has to do with the Bishop's book in the abstract, or with his life, utterly baffles our comprehension. M. Mudry says, in the next place, that, in giving an account of Bishop Bull, he intends to impart more confidence to his readers than they otherwise would have in the work of that great man, and confer a real service upon those to whom the Bishop is unknown! We stand absolutely confounded at the translator's intrepid self-complacency and infatuation. Singular sort of confidence, truly, he is likely to inspire! Surely M. Mudry must be all the while indulging in a little quiet irony, at the expense of Frenchmen! How very admirably calculated M. Mudry's language is to give confidence to Frenchmen, and insensibly and delightfully lead them on to the perusal and study of the work before us! Why, there is not a Frenchman that would not stand aghast at the formidable nonsense so majestically put forth by M. Mudry, and turn away from Bull as he would from the great Sahara. But this is not all. M. Mudry moreover informs us that this notice of his is the best passport he can give to the work before us. Here we quite agree with the biographer. We have no doubt M. Mudry has done his utmost, and that his notice is really the best passport he could give. But why give one at all? It is a most happy circumstance that passports are now abolished, otherwise we apprehend that French *douaniers*, on seeing the sort of passport delivered by M. Mudry, would at once stop Bishop Bull, and this although he appeared '*sous les auspices de la langue Française!*'

But to be serious—and it is really a most serious matter—we fervently hope that M. Mudry's translation will never cross the Channel, or fall into the hands of contributors to the *Monde*, *Correspondant*, *Bibliographie Catholique*, or any other ultramontanist periodical. If the laugh were only at M. Mudry we should not care: but unfortunately he has compromised not only the excellent Society, but the Church, of which that Society has so long, and in past years with such faithfulness, been the representative.

We presume that what M. Mudry intended to say was something to the following effect:—Les pages qui suivent offrent la traduction d'un ouvrage important de l'Evêque Bull, écrit en anglais par ce théologien illustre, en réponse à une lettre de Bossuet. En plaçant au début de ce livre une courte notice sur la vie et les travaux du Docteur Bull, je crois donner plus d'intérêt au présent traité, inspirer plus de confiance à mes lecteurs, et rendre un vrai service à ceux d'entre eux qui ne connaissent pas encore ce grand homme. Nul plus que le savant Evêque n'a su accorder sa conduite avec ses principes. Raconter ici sa vie, c'est donc ajouter à son ouvrage la garantie la plus sûre et la meilleure des recommandations. L'auteur et le livre méritent d'être connus en France; c'est là le motif qui m'a déterminé à présenter au public français une traduction des *Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, et à la faire précéder du récit qu'on va lire.

After the above pleasant exordium we have the following sentence, in which the profundity of thought, richness of meaning, and felicity of diction, are all on a par:—

'On saura donc,' continues M. Mudry, 'que George Bull, connu ensuite sous le nom de Dr. Bull et d'Evêque de St. David [*sic*], naquit le 25 mars, 1634, à Wells, dans la paroisse de St. Cuthbert [*sic*], comté de Somerset, où sa famille se soutenait alors par son industrie et tenait encore un rang fort respectable.'—P. 5.

There are here at least as many blunders as there are lines. 'On saura donc' is flat, redundant, and *familier*, and an educated Frenchman would not commence a sentence thus, especially after what goes before. 'Se soutenait alors par son industrie' is a very equivocal mode of gaining a livelihood, and 'tenait encore un rang fort respectable' is nonsense—unless, indeed, the biographer intends to say that Bull's father was a dishonest character, but that he *nevertheless* held a very respectable position in society. 'Se soutenir par son industrie,' as M. Mudry should know, is equivalent to *vivre d'industrie*, which is always taken *en mauvaise part*. But M. Mudry is fond of using grandiloquent expressions, frequently without comprehending their meaning, and it is only fair he should pay the penalty of his rashness and

ignorance. Of course 'vivait de travail et occupait un rang fort respectable' would be too simple for Bull's biographer. We must also ask M. Mudry whether it was at Wells, or in the county of Somerset (it does not appear, according to M. Mudry, that it was actually at Wells), that Bull's family lived, and whether it was, after all, the *père* Bull himself, or his family, 'qui se soutenait alors par *son* industrie.' Both Saint-David and Saint-Cuthbert are likewise misspelt. These compound words should both have the *trait-d'union*.

Passing over the three next sentences, which, in spite of their brevity, contain some very remarkable specimens of condensed original thought and delicacy of language, as well as one or two ideas apparently borrowed from *feu* Monsieur de la Palisse, we come to the following portentous, as well as pretentious *morceau* :—

'C'est ainsi que fut commencé l'édifice de son éducation ; mais ce fut surtout à l'école publique de Tiverton qu'il se mit à donner des indices non équivoques des talents remarquables dont la Providence l'avait doué.'—P. 5.

'Commencer l'édifice d'une éducation' ! Has M. Mudry no sense of the incongruous and ludicrous? Naturally such a sentence as the following: 'Son éducation commença ainsi ; mais ce fut surtout à l'école publique de Tiverton qu'il donna des preuves non équivoques des talents remarquables dont la Providence l'avait doué,' would again be too simple for such a fine writer as M. Mudry (though, by thus expressing himself, he would have avoided two *futs*, and 'se mit à donner,' which are both bad), and so we must have such concentrated essence of absurdity as 'commencer l'édifice de l'éducation !' But let us proceed. M. Mudry adds—

'Car il en sortit à l'âge de quatorze ans avec la réputation d'un jeune homme d'une grande sobriété, d'une instruction peu commune, et d'une rare facilité pour la composition des vers latins.'—P. 6.

Our biographer seems to delight in repetitions. In his title-page the word *et* occurs seven times ; we have just had three *futs* in four lines ; and now we have one *un* and three *unes* in three lines, as well as the announcement that young Bull had achieved a reputation at the age of fourteen ! We would again venture to substitute our own French for M. Mudry's :—A quatorze ans il sortit de cette école, distingué déjà par sa rare sobriété, son instruction peu commune, et par une extrême facilité pour la composition des vers latins.

Bull's indefatigable biographer *vires acquirit eundo*. He continues :—

'Accompagné de cette excellente recommandation, George Bull se rendit de suite à l'université d'Oxford, et fut honorablement reçu dans "Exeter College," le 10 juillet, 1648 ; où, malgré le penchant qu'il manifesta d'abord pour les

plaisirs et les amusemens de son âge, il finit *pourtant* par devenir un logicien de quelque mérite, et par *se* gagner les bonnes grâces de ses supérieurs.'—P. 6.

'Accompagné de cette excellente recommandation' is again sheer nonsense; M. Mudry ought to have said, 'Muni d'excellents témoignages,' or something of the sort. His *de suite* is also very remarkable. As to the precise signification which M. Mudry attaches here to the word '*pourtant*,' it is quite beyond us. Does he really mean to say that there is any sort of incompatibility between the love of innocent recreation, or, we might add, any sort of recreation, and a logical mind? We fear that M. Mudry's own logic is not superior to his grammar.

In the next sentence M. Mudry delivers himself of the following brilliant piece of imagery:—

'Mais c'étaient alors des jours mauvais pour l'Angleterre! et George Bull, *quoiqu'encore* [how euphonious!] si jeune, ayant refusé, avec tant d'autres de prêter [?] le] serment de fidélité au pouvoir qui s'était *installé dans le pays par l'échafaud* de Charles I., se vit forcé de quitter Oxford avant la fin de 1649.'—P. 6.

The beginning of this passage is very flat again, and un-French. M. Mudry ought to have said, 'Mais l'Angleterre avait alors à traverser des jours mauvais.' Towards the end, M. Mudry adopts once more the grandiloquent style, and, in doing so, talks again, of course, rank and unmitigated rubbish. *Installer un pouvoir par l'échafaud!!* This is an idea which, we believe, had never before entered anybody's head; but then M. Mudry is a very original thinker and writer also, and possesses marvellous powers of conception, as well as of illustration.

We are next informed that young Bull prosecuted his studies under the Rector of Ubley, and that his '*caractère prit cet air de gravité qu'il a toujours retenu dans la suite*,' which means, that he never forgot the grave tune—for that is the only possible meaning of *retenir un air*—which he was taught by the Puritan Rector! Might we be allowed to ask M. Mudry what tune that was? Is it possible, once again, that such ludicrous absurdities should be sanctioned and put forth by the Christian Knowledge Society?

Besides learning a tune, according to M. Mudry, young Bull seems, according to the same authority, to have done something more. Let M. Mudry again speak, with his own exact delicacy of phrase and exquisite perception:—

'D'ailleurs il sut si bien profiter des conseils de ses vrais amis, et des moyens qu'il avait de s'instruire, qu'il eut bientôt amplement réparé tout le temps qu'il *pouvait* avoir perdu précédemment; et il faut *ajouter* [*sic*] qu'il s'était principalement occupé de la théologie et de l'histoire ecclésiastique.'—P. 6.

The ideas, the way in which they are expressed, the logic, the orthography, the syntax—all, again, is on a par. What *can* M. Mudry possibly mean? This is one of the most dismal sen-

tences we have ever read. The language may be 'tudesque, jargon ou patois;' but it certainly is not the 'langue du grand peuple franc.'

What young Bull did after he had completed his studies, the biographer shall himself once more tell us in his own peculiar phraseology:—

'Ayant enfin achevé ses études, George Bull se ressouvint des vœux qu'avait exprimés son père *avant de mourir*; et consultant son propre cœur, IL FUT PERSUADÉ que sa vocation était de les accomplir, et d'entrer *sans délai* [*sic*], dans l'état ecclésiastique. Mais il avait assez bien profité de ses lectures théologiques pour ne pas pouvoir se contenter d'un mission presbytérienne, aussi long temps qu'il ne lui était pas impossible de faire autrement.'—Pp. 6, 7.

M. Mudry is determined to copy Monsieur de la Palisse, and to play the part of Martine to the end.

'De pas mis avec rien tu fais la récidive,
Et c'est, comme on t'a dit, trop d'une négative.'

What could be easier than to write the last sentence thus?—Mais il avait trop profité de ses études théologiques, pour pouvoir se contenter des ordres presbytériens, tant qu'il lui serait possible de recevoir des ordres légitimes.

But enough of this. 'Il y a des absurdités,' says Souvestre, 'devant lesquelles l'esprit s'arrête comme devant l'infini.' Here we ourselves shall stop, for *décidément nous nous y perdons*; and indeed we believe our readers have had quite enough of M. Mudry's picturesque *charabia*. Besides, to notice all the mistakes and blunders contained in the book before us would require a whole number of this periodical. We shall, therefore, at once terminate our extracts from M. Mudry's compositions. We have only examined two pages, and even less, of the 'Life of Bull;' but the remainder of it, and the translation which follows, are not at all better. In the next two or three pages we meet with such things as the following:—'*Réalisé* toute la bonne opinion'; '*préscri*'; '*prenait* une peine particulière à bien enseigner,' &c. &c. '*fonds* baptismaux'; '*à sommer* les pécheurs à la repentance'; '*il est dit*'; 'Grand-Chancelier d'Angleterre'; '*demeura* Recteur'; '*qui étaient* à chanceler'; '*obtenir* la réputation d'un orateur brillant'; '*connaissant* à un haut degré l'Hébreu'; '*avaient* coûté'; '*parut* sur la scène du monde comme un auteur'; '*faire une figure* prééminente,' &c. &c. &c. There is not a sentence, hardly a line, in this *rudis indigestaque moles*, which does not contain some incongruity in the images (M. Mudry is very fond of imagery), some grotesqueness or absurdity in the sentiment, some impropriety or blunder in the language; frequently we find all these defects combined *dans une magnifique unité*. It is really astonishing how M. Mudry

can contrive to accumulate impropriety upon impropriety, mistake upon mistake, blunder upon blunder. Provincialisms, wordiness, discordant epithets, incoherent and unintelligible crudities, faults of orthography, accentuation, punctuation, and grammar generally—not to speak of the unacknowledged appropriations from *La Palisse*—follow each other in most rapid and edifying succession ;

‘ Et les moindres défauts de ce *hardi génie*
Sont ou le pléonasme, ou la cacophonie.’

The publication of a work of this nature can be of no use to those into whose hands it is likely to fall ; they would not read a page of it without being frightened out of all propriety, or laughing heartily. In conception, sentiment, and language, it is the very worst piece of biography we have ever read ; and yet we must be gravely told that this very attractive composition is intended to serve as a passport to poor Bishop Bull, and to give confidence to French readers !

We may possibly, for expressing this opinion of M. Mudry's book, be accused of not possessing a very keen and discerning sympathy with the lofty aspirations of genius, or even of a settled purpose, *per fas et nefas*, to depreciate that gentleman's interesting labours ; but we beg to say we have not set down aught in malice, and that we have rather extenuated than exaggerated his defects. There is no Society which is better enabled than the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to publish a good translation of Bull's ‘Corruptions ;’ and there is, we believe, no Society which would venture to put forth the thing we have been briefly examining. It is not only very discreditable, but very injurious and culpable ; it is a high crime and misdemeanour against English theology generally and Bishop Bull in particular, as well as against the French language. We hear people frequently speaking of the ‘humble task’ of translators, and so forth : it may be an humble task, but it is a very difficult one, requiring a combination of several qualifications not often united in the same person ; and the difficulty of the task is incontrovertibly demonstrated by the paucity of really good translations. People may differ, as Marmontel tells us they do, as to what actually constitutes a good translation ; but all those who have spoken or written on the subject must at any rate be agreed on this point, viz. that a person should at least possess an ordinary acquaintance with the language into which he professes to translate. The two first works mentioned at the head of this paper show that this is not always the case. We trust these are the last translations we shall see from

M. Mudry's pen. The task appears to us beyond his strength, and in undertaking it he wanders from his legitimate province. There is scarcely a sentence of his which does not indicate his unfitness for the duties of French translator; the printing of such works as the two specimens before us appears to us a deplorable waste of money; and their circulation may be attended with very injurious consequences to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and to the Church.

"We now come to the French Prayer-Book. In a memorandum addressed to the Standing Committee by the Foreign Translation Committee, dated November, 1860, and printed in the Society's Report for 1861 (p. 95), we meet with the following singular account of it:—

'In 1835, the Bishop of Winchester represented that *the* French version of the Liturgy in use in the Channel Islands may be safely adopted with certain corrections. In 1839 a revision of this Liturgy was undertaken, but it was expressly stated that it was not intended for Guernsey or Jersey (each of these islands having a Version of its own), but for use in England, and *for circulation in France and in British Colonies*. An edition was published in 1842, and in 1846 (? 1845) an edition which had been subject to still further revision, and has since been frequently reprinted.'

This is a strange and clumsily worded paragraph. It contains, also, some mistakes as to actual matters of fact, and a palpably self-contradictory statement; for if Jersey and Guernsey—to say nothing of Alderney and Sark—have each a version of their own (as we are informed they have), it is rather difficult to understand by what process the Bishop of Winchester could possibly manage to represent that *the* French version of the Liturgy in use in 'the Channel Islands may be safely adopted with certain corrections.' . . . But we pass on to more important matters. It may appear an indiscreet and bold proceeding to set oneself against the Bishop of Winchester, but, in spite of the respect which is due to his so formally expressed opinion on the matter, we feel that we must join issue with his lordship. How far, before recommending 'the safe adoption,' 'with certain corrections,' of 'the French 'version of the Liturgy in use in the Channel Islands,' the Bishop had carefully and anxiously examined the whole of the book, was perfectly acquainted with its contents, and had considered all the advantages and disadvantages of the measure, we are not told; but that does not prevent us from recording our own deliberate conviction that, in adopting the course recommended by Dr. Sumner, the Society acted very unwisely. 'The French version of the Liturgy in use in the Channel Islands,' in 1835, 'with certain corrections!' It does not appear that the Bishop informed the Society what the nature of these 'certain

corrections' was to be, and, in the absence of any actual *data*, we will not attempt to solve the mystery. Anyhow, when it is known to what the French Prayer-Book in question had been reduced, it must be confessed that the Bishop was not very exacting. The Prefaces, Tables, and Ordination Services had been altogether expunged; *Ministre* in most places had been substituted for *Prêtre*; the most unwarrantable changes had been introduced into many of the Rubrics, which in some places had become, in consequence, self-contradictory and nonsensical, while other Rubrics had been ruthlessly suppressed; the most flagitious tampering with the language of some of the prayers, frequently involving serious doctrinal obliquities, had been indulged in; some of the Offices had been transposed; and the work, generally, mutilated, disfigured, abridged, falsified, and puritanised to an extent that would satisfy Lord Ebury and the most rabid and thorough-paced Liturgical reformers of the present time—nay, that, since 1835, has appeared to satisfy even the Bishop of Winchester himself! 'Certain corrections!' But the greater portion of the book, especially if intended 'for circulation in France,' should have been translated anew. Indeed, we perceive that the Society has given what appears very much like a new translation of some parts: such, for instance, as the Psalms, of which the French is excellent, and the Epistles and Gospels (taken, apparently, from a modernised edition of Martin); and we very much regret that, instead of subjecting the book to periodical patchings and revisions, it should not originally have declined acting on the Bishop of Winchester's 'representation,' and had the whole work retranslated by competent persons. Not that we have any fault to find with the actual revisions. We have compared some of the last editions with the first ones, and find a decided improvement. The book has been revised, and revised for the better; but we must add that the improvements are infinitesimally small, and by no means commensurate with the necessities of the case; that the work is in great want of additional and most extensive revision; that it is yet by no means adapted for 'circulation in France;' that it contains much that is feeble, inadequate, bald, inconsistent, clumsy, trivial, fantastic, ungrammatical, absurd, and that is not to be found in the original; and that, in many places, the French bears the same relation to the English that oil of vitriol does to oil of olives.

We have adverted to M. Mudry's remarkable title-pages; that of the Prayer-Book before us deserves a passing notice. What is the meaning of the *six et cæteras* found there? We would look in vain, we believe, into any English Prayer-Book for anything of the sort. What do they stand for? Such a way

of rendering the English title is a gross violation of the most elementary principles of translation, and *et cæteras* are a species of embellishment we have never noticed in any other translation of the Book of Common Prayer. Is it that the English title is untranslatable? But we have often seen it translated correctly enough—it is excellently translated in a new edition of the French Prayer-Book recently printed at the Oxford University Press, and generally adopted, if we mistake not, in the Channel Islands. Andrew Marvell has well defined some of the duties of a translator, and we would venture to commend his words to those who are responsible for the French translations of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge:—

'He is translation's thief that addeth more,
As much as he that taketh from the store
Of the first author. Here he maketh blots;
That mends; and added beauties are but spots.'

Not that we should indulge in such Utopian dreams as to expect to find positive 'beauties,' borrowed or otherwise, from the Society's French editors; but we have, at least, a right to demand that the Society shall translate the English Prayer-Book (if it undertakes the task at all) in its integrity, and that it shall give us a *bonâ fide* version of the original, without addition or subtraction, and certainly without *et cæteras*.

We will give, by way of illustration, a few specimens of the mistakes and blunders to be met with in this book, adding, in order to facilitate reference, the pages where they are to be found, as well as the emendations we should propose. These mistakes can be numbered by the thousands, and may be ranged under three distinct heads:—1. Omissions; 2. Incorrect renderings; 3. Bad grammar. Sometimes, however, it happens, that all these mistakes, as in M. Mudry's translations, are skilfully combined in the same passage. We use the last edition, published in 1859:—

'Pourquoi quelques unes ont été abolies et d'autres retenues.'—P. iii.

'Dans leurs demandes.'—P. vi.

'Que pour un bon but.'—P. vii.

'Que nous aurions dû ne pas faire.'

—P. 3.

'Prêtre.'—P. 5, *et passim*.

'Alors se lira de même.'—P. 11.

'Le Prince Consort.'—*Passim*.

'Diable.'—P. 34, *et passim*.

'Au milieu de ton Eglise.'—P. 39.

'Les Evêques et LES [!] Pasteurs de ton troupeau.'—P. 44.

Pourquoi quelques-unes ont été abolies et d'autres conservées.

Dans ses demandes.

Qu'en vue d'un but excellent.

Que nous n'aurions pas dû faire.

Le Prêtre.

Alors on lira de même.

Le Prince Epoux.

Démon.

Au milieu de ta sainte Eglise.

Les Evêques et Pasteurs de ton troupeau.

'Promus à quelque fonction sacrée.'
—*Ibid.*

'Après l'une ou l'autre.'—P. 45.

'A l'édification de ton Eglise.'—*Ibid.*

'Tettent.'—P. 64.

'Dans toutes nos nécessités.'—
P. 76.

'Des dons du Saint-Esprit.'—
P. 231.

'Pourvu pour cet objet.'—P. 260.

'Quand il y aura Communion, le
Prêtre mettra sur la Table.'—*Ibid.*

'Il est très-raisonnable, il est très-
juste.'—P. 270.

'Sang précieux.'—P. 273.

'Après l'avoir eu instituée.'—*Ibid.*

'De ce que nous sommes maintenant
vrais membres.'—P. 276.

'Il est d'usage qu'ils communient
tous les Dimanches.'—P. 280.

'Alors chaque paroissien.'—*Ibid.*

'Ce serait une vraie idolâtrie.'

'Il implique contradiction, qu'ils se
trouvent en plus d'un lieu à la fois.'—
P. 281.

'Remplis d'eau pure.'—P. 282.

'Qu'il soit reçu dans l'Eglise de
Jésus-Christ, et qu'il en devienne un
véritable membre.'—*Ibid.*

'Fidèles et chers [!] enfants.'—Pp.
285, 294.

'Selon l'ordre prescrit par l'Eglise.'
—P. 288.

'Ce formulaire.'—P. 290.

'Commodément auprès des Fonts.'
—P. 294.

'Institué de Dieu.'—P. 303.

'Le Prêtre, allant à la rencontre du
Corps jusqu'à l'entrée du Cimetière,
dira ou chantera avec les clercs.'—
P. 317.

'Ne fait point de bon fruit.'—P. 325.

'Ces divers Ordres parmi ceux qui
en sont les Ministres.'—P. 539.

'Et ces Dignités ont toujours été
tenues dans la plus haute Estime et
la plus haute Vénération, afin que
personne ne pût s'ingérer à en exercer
la moindre des fonctions. . . . et sans
être connu pour en avoir les qualités
requis, sans même avoir été ap-
prouvé, et ensuite avoir été admis par
l'Autorité légitime.'—*Ibid.*

NO. CXVII.—N.S.

Admis à quelque fonction sacrée.

Après l'une quelconque.

A l'avantage de ta sainte Eglise.
Sont à la mamelle.

Dans tous nos dangers et dans toutes
nos nécessités.

Des dons spéciaux du Saint-Esprit.

Fourni pour cet objet.

A CE MOMENT, quand il y aura
Communion, le Prêtre mettra sur la
Table.

Il est véritablement raisonnable, il
est véritablement juste.

Sang très-précieux.

Après l'avoir instituée.

De ce que nous sommes membres
véritables.

Il communieront tous ensemble
avec le Prêtre chaque Dimanche au
moins.

Et tous les ans à Pâques, chaque
paroissien.

Ce serait une idolâtrie.

Et c'est une chose contraire à la
vérité du Corps naturel de Jésus-Christ,
que d'être en plus d'un lieu à la fois.

Qui seront alors remplis d'eau pure.

Qu'il soit reçu dans la sainte Eglise
de Jésus-Christ, et qu'il en devienne
membre vivant.

Enfants fidèles et élus.

Selon l'ordre légitime prescrit par
l'Eglise.

Cette formule.

Commodément auprès des Fonts,
selon qu'il le jugera convenable.

Institué par Dieu.

Le Prêtre et les Clercs, après avoir
été au-devant du Corps jusqu'à l'entrée
du Cimetière, et le précédant, diront
ou chanteront.

Ne produit point de bon fruit.

Ces divers Ordres de Ministres.

Et ces dignités ont toujours été
regardées avec une telle estime et une
telle vénération, que nul homme ne
pouvait se permettre d'en exercer la
moindre des fonctions. . . . et sans
être reconnu posséder les qualités re-
quis, et aussi sans avoir été approuvé
et ensuite admis par l'autorité légitime.

'Personne ne sera admis à l'Ordre de Diacre qu'à l'âge de vingt-trois ans [!!!], si ce n'est qu'il n'en ait obtenu la Dispense. Nul ne sera ordonné Prêtre, qu'à vingt-quatre ans [!!!].—*Ibid.*

'Prenez garde que les personnes.'—P. 540.

'Convoiteux d'un gain déshonnête.'—P. 544.

'De qui.'—P. 545.

'Reçois le pouvoir.'—P. 546.

'Ensuite l'Evêque lira l'Office de la Communion.'—P. 546.

'Jusqu'à ce qu'elle se soit disculpée du Crime, ou de l'Empêchement.'—P. 547. [Se disculper d'un empêchement !!]

'Au Saint Etat auquel.'—P. 550.

'Auront à recevoir.'—P. 554.

'Passera ensuite au Service de la Communion.'—Pp. 554, 561.

'Administre l'ordre du Diaconat.'—P. 555.

'Recevront l'Ordre de Diacres.'—*Ibid.*

'Donné plusieurs dons.'—*Ibid.*

'A l'édification de ton Eglise.'—P. 558.

'Avant de vous agréger à cette Administration.'—*Ibid.*

'Non pour la destruction, mais pour l'édification.'—P. 560.

'Articles de Foi.'—P. 568 et *passim*.

Personne ne sera admis à l'Ordre du Diaconat avant l'âge de vingt-trois ans, à moins d'avoir obtenu une Dispense. Nul ne sera ordonné Prêtre avant l'âge de vingt-quatre ans.

Prenez soin que les personnes.

Avides d'un gain déshonnête.

Desquels.

Reçois l'autorité.

Ensuite l'Evêque continuera l'Office de la Communion.

Jusqu'à ce qu'elle se soit disculpée du crime, ou qu'elle ait écarté l'empêchement.

Aux saintes fonctions auxquelles.

Devront recevoir.

Continuera ensuite le Service de la Communion.

Confère l'ordre du Diaconat.

Seront admis à l'Ordre du Diaconat.

Fait plusieurs dons.

A l'édification et au bon gouvernement de ton Eglise.

Avant de vous admettre à ces Fonctions.

Non pour la destruction, mais pour le salut.

Articles de Religion.

The above specimens are taken, for the most part, at haphazard, and could be multiplied *ad infinitum*; but we fear we have already exceeded our limits. Moreover, we do not profess *de faire une critique à fond*. It will perhaps be urged that it is easy to find mistakes in all translations; that, as Destouches says,

'La critique est aisée, et l'art est difficile;'

and that frequently it is a matter of opinion as to what really is a good translation. But there can only be one opinion in regard to the translation before us: frequently it is not a translation, but a mistranslation; and as to the facility with which mistakes can be found in translations, we fear that, as regards the Society's French Prayer-Book, the difficulty would be not to find them. As we have said, it often happens that the Society does not translate at all, and still oftener that the translation is crude, ungrammatical, and absurd. What will be said to the following, both as a translation and as a piece of

French? 'Etes-vous convaincus que c'est par un mouvement du Saint-Esprit que vous vous engagez dans ce Ministère et dans cet *Emploi*?—(P. 545.) What will be said to the following piece of verse?—

'Des joies du Ciel, du bonheur de la Vie,
De tous les biens, source unique, infinie.'—P. 552.

Doubtless some of the expressions adduced in the above list are simple mistranslations, and are not of very great consequence, but they are mistranslations nevertheless; most of them, however, are gross and palpable blunders, and are of immense importance. There are also many whole sentences, and even paragraphs, as well as isolated passages, scattered with somewhat exuberant and unnatural prodigality in different parts of the book, especially in the Preface, the Rubrics, the Communion, and Occasional Services generally, and the Ordinal, of which the construction is hopelessly and radically vicious. It would be useless to point out special blunders; *ce sont toutes phrases à refaire*. The work is also replete with mistakes of another character, which indicate great carelessness and slovenliness—but possibly they did not come under the category of the 'certain corrections' that were requisite. Over and over again the very same words, for no reason that we can divine, are translated in different ways. For instance, in the Office for the Burial of the Dead, at page 320, we read, 'Afin qu'il soit rendu conforme à son corps glorieux, selon l'efficace par laquelle il peut même s'assujettir toutes choses;' but, at page 538, this is transformed into 'afin qu'il devienne conforme à son corps glorieux, selon le pouvoir qu'il a de s'assujettir toutes choses.' 'Lord, hear our prayer,' or 'prayers,' which occurs in the Versicles, in the Order for Confirmation and following offices, is variously translated, 'Seigneur, exauce notre prière,' 'écoute notre prière,' 'écoute notre requête;' while 'trust in Thee' is also rendered 'confiance en toi,' and 'espérance en toi.' If we have reckoned rightly, the formula, or its equivalent, 'who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end,' is translated in seven different ways. In one place we have 'Fête de S. Simon et S. Jude;' in another, 'Fête de S. Simon et de S. Jude,' which is a very different thing. Most wretched also, throughout, is the punctuation. The commencement of the *Jubilate* is printed correctly enough, 'Vous, tous les habitants,' &c. The *Benedicite*, on the contrary, begins thus: 'Vous toutes les œuvres du Seigneur,' and so on to the end. Of course there should be a comma after the 'Vous,' as also between the 'nous,' and the 'misérables pécheurs,' occurring in the Litany. Sometimes we find, at the end of a prayer, 'par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur,' though

generally, 'par Jésus-Christ, notre Seigneur.' Thus, again, most of the prayers are made to terminate in this way—', par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur.' The '*par*' should be preceded by a semicolon. In French *Paroissiens*, 'Par Jésus-Christ' constitutes a sentence of itself. In accordance with this peculiar mode of punctuation, we find several prayers, such, for instance, as the General Thanksgiving, terminating thus—', par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur; à qui, comme à toi et au Saint-Esprit, 'soient tout honneur èt toute gloire, aux siècles des siècles.' In the Morning and Evening Services, and elsewhere, the Lord's Prayer commences in the following way: 'Notre Père, qui es aux Cieux. Ton Nom soit sanctifié,' and in the occasional offices thus: 'Notre Père, qui es aux cieux, ton Nom soit sanctifié,' which is the correct way. At page 266, we meet with the following extraordinary specimen of punctuation: 'Nous 'mangeons et nous buvons notre propre jugement; ne *discernant* ' [an incorrect expression] point le Corps du Seigneur; nous 'allumons,' &c. If we are not mistaken, this blunder has been perpetrated in every edition of the French Prayer-Book published by the Society; we have seen it in three at least. In one or two places, *Let us pray* is not translated at all, and *Amen* is incorrectly printed. 'De telle sorte' frequently occurs when 'de telle manière' would be preferable. 'Christ,' also, and 'de Christ' are used, instead of 'le Christ,' and 'du Christ,' or, what is still better, 'Jésus-Christ;,' while there is sad confusion in the use of the words 'dire,' 'lire,' 'réciter,' 'répéter,' and 'chanter.' We have noticed M. Mudry's great aversion to *traits-d'union*, just where they are wanted. The editor of the Prayer-Book before us, on the contrary, has a remarkable partiality for them where they are not wanted. Thus we have, 'tout-à-fait' (page 32), 'bien-heureuse' (page 53), 'long-temps' (page 307). As to the mere typographical mistakes, they are very few. We notice here and there such things as 'ajoâte' (pages 46, 47), 'trâces' (page 229), 'indamniser' (page 304), 'réposent' (page 320); but it is very possible these mistakes are the editor's, and not the printer's.

We do trust that the Christian Knowledge Society will at once place this Prayer-Book into the hands of a competent editor, who will subject the whole of it, with the exception of the Psalms, and the Epistles and Gospels (though the punctuation of these requires amendment), not to 'certain corrections' only, but to a thorough and most complete revision, and who will take care to combine fidelity of translation with correctness of language. In numberless places the force and meaning of the original have evaporated, and many whole passages require re-translation. As a whole the book is most unworthy the

original; it is even unworthy the Society; and we should only put it into the hands of a Frenchman through sheer want of something better. If revised with care from beginning to end, something could perhaps be made of the French 'Wilson;' but as it is, though it might possibly do for the *pâtres* of Savoy, for the *habitants* of the wilds of Canada, or for the fishermen of Herm and Jethou, it certainly is not adapted for circulation among Frenchmen. With regard to Bull's 'Corruptions,' or rather M. Mudry's, they ought to be instantaneously and mercilessly suppressed.

It is with no pleasurable, but, on the contrary, very mournful feelings, that we have felt compelled to make these remarks upon the works before us. If we could have commended them, we should have done so cheerfully; but this was impossible. No private individuals would venture to put them forth, and it is quite clear the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge ought not to do so. Of course we do not object to the Society's publishing translations of some of the best works on its lists (would that the catalogue were extended!)—just the reverse. There never was a more favourable opportunity than the present for the publication and dissemination of sound theological works in different European languages; and we should be glad to see the Society avail itself of it judiciously and largely. One excellent Society is already engaged in the task of enlightening foreigners on the *status* and principles of our Church; and with its ample funds, varied machinery, and unprecedented capabilities, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge might effectively co-operate with the Anglo-Continental in this hitherto most neglected, but most useful and necessary work. Correct and unmutilated translations of the Prayer-Book are especially within its province: and in its Foreign Translation Committee there are men of varied literature and extensive knowledge. We trust that next time we visit the Society's depository in search of translations, French or other, we shall be furnished with scholarlike books, such as would not do discredit either to the reputation of the Society, to the learned men who sit on its Committees, or to the Church of England, the interests and, indeed, the principles of which are scarcely served by such productions as those which we have been obliged to censure.

ART. II.—*The Existence of Evil Spirits proved, and their Agency, particularly in Relation to the Human Race, explained and illustrated.* By WALTER SCOTT.

IN a recent number we briefly noticed one of the series of the 'Congregational Lectures,' and could only express our regret, if not our surprise, that a subject so important should not have met with more worthy treatment. There are many others of the same series which are interesting and deserve our notice. At present we select one which, we think, will give our readers a much more favourable notion of the 'Congregational Lectures' than they could derive from Dr. Bennett's specimen.

In the work to which we allude, the president and tutor of Aire-dale College, a Dissenters' institution in Yorkshire, has chosen for his lectures a subject which we do not remember to have seen elsewhere treated in so popular a manner, and, we may fairly add, speaking generally, in a manner so edifying, and, upon the whole, orthodox. Not only does 'Walter Scott'—for so the author of these lectures is designated simply¹—defend the clear revelations of the Scripture concerning the existence of evil spirits, and their agency in relation to mankind, but he brings before us, in the early part of his work, some startling illustrations of the strange errors of certain 'free thinkers' of the present day respecting these truths. For instance, he quotes in his preface, from a pamphlet entitled 'The Devil,' an argument that because the devil is an evil spirit, it is atheism to believe that he exists at all, which thus concludes elegantly, that 'these devil-holders are practical atheists.' Again, in words quoted only, we believe, by our author, as by ourselves, to show what notions are held by certain gainsayers, the same irreverent writer argues that 'there is no necessity for a devil,' and quotes S. Paul's account of the works of the flesh, asking 'if the flesh is *capable to produce* (*sic*) all these, what is left for the devil to do?'

Since rubbish like this has been delivered in lectures, and afterwards published in a popular form, we must acknowledge

¹ It may be well at once to warn the reader of the danger of a confusion almost worse than the well-known puzzle in early ecclesiastical history between Novatus and Novatian. There are connected with this subject of communication with evil spirits no less than *four* writers of the name of *Scott*. 1. Walter Scott, of Airedale, our author. 2. Sir Walter Scott, Bart. of Abbotsford. 3. Reginald Scott, who wrote against the belief in witchcraft, and died A.D. 1599. 4. Russell Scott, a modern Sadducee, author of a work entitled, 'Analytical Investigation, or Scriptural Claims of the Devil.'

the obligation owing from all believers in Holy Scripture to Walter Scott's defence of the doctrine concerning evil spirits contained in the Bible. In this ninth series of the 'Congregational Lectures,' he discusses the existence of evil spirits, their character, state, and powers, their agency, the nature and manner of their intercourse with this world; the demoniacs of the New Testament, our Saviour's temptation, and the temptations of Satan in their ordinary form. Our readers will at once see how much of deep interest and close concern to every Christian this brief programme is capable of comprising. The general spirit of reverence with which he treats the testimony of others, and the supervision of Divine wisdom over the true doctrine of Scripture on the subject, is a pleasing feature in these Lectures. And though occasionally liberal (somewhat in excess), when speaking of the opposers of the doctrine he defends, yet the Congregational lecturer does not hesitate to speak elsewhere in very plain language concerning those modern Sadducees, who believe not in angels nor spirits, good or bad. Most truly does he state that 'those who maintain that evil spirits are the figments of a deluded imagination very generally deny the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel.' (P. 12.)

It is positively refreshing to find in a Congregational teacher the edifying and reasonable specimens which we subjoin of a line of argument not at all less true or less lucid because, if fairly carried out, it would effectually overturn the sandy foundations of Congregationalism itself. 'It is surely very strange,' argues the lecturer (and we fully agree with him), 'and far from being calculated to exalt our ideas of the volume of inspiration, or to increase our confidence in it, that the doctrine of the non-existence of evil spirits, if it be true, should remain utterly unknown for 1700 years: that the multitudes who were most earnestly desirous to ascertain the real meaning of the Word of God, and to take it as the rule of their conduct, should have been led by its language, and by the way in which the Saviour performed His miracles, to embrace a tenet which at last is found to be absurd, and even a gross reflection on the government and character of God; for in this light it is represented by our opponents.' (P. 15.) Elsewhere he speaks even more emphatically. 'Allow that they were some of the angels who kept not their first estate, and who are represented as the angels of Satan, and then everything in the passage' (Luke x. 17) 'is plain and natural. On the other supposition, everything is strained and unnatural, and our Lord employed language which His disciples could not possibly, in their circumstances, understand; nay, which necessarily confirmed, I had almost said sanctioned, some grossly erroneous

'views which they entertained; and He has thus contributed much to lead His followers, in all subsequent ages, into mistakes on a very important subject. Who can believe that the great Prophet and Teacher would act in this way? and that, too, when the great end of His mission, the destruction of the works of the devil, was concerned?' (Pp. 250-1.)

These are sound and sensible remarks; and we can only wish that Mr. Scott, and all other Congregationalists, would follow them out to the point to which they inevitably lead, viz. a reasonable belief in the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in its teaching, in every age, since the Christian era. At the risk of anticipating what we shall have to notice more particularly hereafter, we are tempted to apply the sober judicious arguments just quoted to the Church's doctrine of baptismal regeneration, held always, everywhere, and by all people. Might we not paraphrase the passage, and apply it thus to our blessed Saviour's words to Nicodemus?—'Allow that, when Christians are baptized, they are born of water and of the Spirit, and then everything in the words of Christ (S. John iii. 3, 5) is plain and natural. On the other supposition, everything is strained and unnatural, and our Lord employed language which was almost sure to be misunderstood, and to lead His followers, in all subsequent ages, into error on a very important subject. Who can believe that the great Prophet and Teacher would act in this way? and that, too, when one great end of His mission, the new birth unto righteousness, which is the entrance into His kingdom, was concerned?'

To us, the antidote here provided in one of the 'Congregational Lectures' to one of the common errors of Congregationalism, appears most complete and satisfactory. And if the popular objection be made against the Church's system of 'being regenerate' first, and then striving to be 'daily renewed,' that this is too easy a system, and tends to false security, we may fairly ask in what respect the Calvinistic system is more difficult or less lulling? Were Calvinists consistent—which, happily, they often are not—self-examination and striving to enter in at the strait gate would be as quietly set aside by them as S. Paul's idea of becoming a castaway is evaporated in their able master's gloss upon that well-known text. We subjoin it, as one of the best specimens of a quiet mode of shirking an awkward passage we ever met with. Calvin thus paraphrases 1 Cor. ix. 27: '*Vita mea aliis regula quædam esse debet: contendendo igitur ita me gerere, ne doctrinæ mores mei et opera repugnent, atque ita cum magno dedecore et gravi fratrū meorum offendiculo ea negligam quæ ab aliis requiro*'!

But while we feel justified in having turned the attention of

our readers towards the antidote furnished by our author, however unwittingly, against one of the most common and worst errors of the conventicle, and of those who sympathise with its peculiar teaching, we gladly resume our consideration of the generally correct and sober way in which Mr. Scott treats the interesting and important subject of his Lectures. In the first place, his specimens of the fashion in which Holy Scripture is interpreted by those that deny the existence of evil spirits are certainly rather startling, and to us, we acknowledge, quite novel. We must bespeak our readers' patience, while we enter somewhat at length upon these extraordinary samples of error, and ignorance of the Scriptures, amongst our modern Sadducees.

The well-known text in 2 Peter ii. 4 is thus translated by one of these unbelieving writers, who understands the whole passage to apply to the spies, or messengers (angels), sent to search the land of Canaan. 'For if God spared not the *messengers* that 'sinned, but having tartarized them with chains of darkness, 'delivered them, thus reserved, unto judgment,' &c. The commentary that follows is worthy of the translation: 'The spies 'sinned,' for when they returned they laid before the people an evil report: they were 'tartarized with chains of darkness,' *i.e.* judicially blinded. And then, to complete the confusion of ideas, this writer quoted by Walter Scott identifies the 'false prophets' at verse 1 with the 'angels' in v. 4! The Congregational lecturer candidly meets, and fully refutes, all this gratuitous and irreverent absurdity; though it may seem, after all, scarcely worth while to do so, since the man who disbelieves the existence of evil spirits is not likely to have any very strong faith in the canonicity of S. Peter's Second Epistle.

However, to the Churchman it is refreshing and encouraging to see a learned Congregationalist employing against those who deny truths which he holds in common with us arguments which will tell in the Church's favour against dissent. Thus, what our lecturer says in favour of the translation 'angels,' instead of 'messengers' or 'spies,' well deserves the attention of those who stoutly deny the change recorded by early writers to have been gradually wrought in the meaning of words like *ἐπίσκοπος*, &c. 'Words,' Walter Scott tells his Congregational hearers, 'very frequently drop their original signification; and, 'in consequence of the change of customs, and of modes of 'thought and expression, this is almost forgotten, while they 'are used in quite a different sense.' (P. 21.)

Again, when the lecturer applies to the meaning of the word 'reserved' (*τετηρημένους*) this remark, 'The perfect relates to the past as connected with the present,' he sanctions the very principle which, if applied to 1 John iii. 9, dispels much of the

obscurity with which modern theories have clouded that glorious text.¹ No better rebuke could have been given to these modern theories than that of our author, who truly states that, if the apostles (S. Peter and S. Jude) had intended 'the spies who brought up an evil report,' they would have said what they meant, as they did when speaking of Egypt, or of Sodom and Gomorrah. They would not, he well says, 'have used terms 'which have led ninety-nine out of a hundred of those who 'have read their writings to imagine that they referred to 'angelic beings; while it was left to the ingenuity of those 'who should live hundreds of years afterward to stretch their 'language on the rack of criticism, and elicit from it quite a 'different meaning from its apparently natural import!' (P. 27.) A tacit yet severe rebuke to many a popular religious theory! To take an example, corroborating what has been already said, from the book just quoted: 'If our Lord meant simply to 'direct Nicodemus to seek a new heart, is it likely that He 'would have expressed so old a truth in such new terms? And 'when Nicodemus (to all appearance a sincere inquirer) asks 'for an explanation, still more strange does it seem that our 'Lord should have increased the difficulty a thousand fold, by 'connecting *water* with the Spirit, as a needful element in 'bringing about such a change.' (Sadler's *Second Adam*, p. 26.)

It would be impossible to notice here the wild inventions of the writers quoted by Walter Scott respecting the meaning of the word translated 'devil' (*διδβολος*). In S. John viii. 44, it means, so they say, the Jewish Sanhedrim: elsewhere, a calumniator, or persecutor, or false accuser of the Christians; or, in short, anything but what the word has always been understood to mean by all Christians.² One specimen of Scripture interpretation, from a namesake of our author's, Russell Scott, who wrote 'Lectures on the Scriptural Claims of the Devil,' is too curious to be omitted. This writer explains the devil and his angels, mentioned in the latter part of S. Matthew xxv., to mean the persecuting power of Rome. The sheep are the Christians; the goats, the Jews. The everlasting fire is the temporal national calamities in which the opponents and persecutors of the Christians were involved. And both the reward and punishment here mentioned 'must,' in spite of our blessed Lord's own assertion, 'be of a temporary nature only,' according to Mr. Russell Scott's infallible *dictum*. How this can be made to tally with the historical fact that the *sheep* were more or

¹ See Mr. Sadler's admirable work, 'The Second Adam and the New Birth,' with the reference to Pool and Hammond in the note, p. 149.

² 'Satan is always used as a figurative appellation, and signifies almost anything or everything.' (Russell Scott, quoted by W. Scott, p. 52.)

less persecuted for nearly three hundred years, while the *goats* were also severely persecuted, and the *devil* and *his angels* wholly free from persecution, he does not tell us. But well does the Congregational lecturer observe, with reference to this preposterous rubbish: 'If I could think that the Socinian explanation of this passage were even plausible, I should immediately lose all confidence in the Bible, and question whether any man could have satisfactory evidence that he understood a single sentence it contains.' (P. 37.)

At the risk of being somewhat tedious, we must refer to two or three more samples of the reverence and reasoning which are being applied to the elucidation of Holy Scripture, and its teaching respecting evil spirits, by men, professing themselves to be wise men, in the present day. We know not where to look for a more concise yet complete account of these extraordinary interpretations than that given by Walter Scott in the earlier portion of his work. According to one of these most unreasonable, as well as unbelieving, *philosophers*, 'In the history of our Lord's temptations, Satan means in the first [temptation] "hunger," though we are informed that it was *after* He was hungry that the tempter came to Him: and this tempter is represented as a rational being entering into conversation with Him: in the second, "presumption and vanity;" and in the third, "ambition, as gratified by regal power and riches."' (P. 53.)

Mr. Russell Scott, under the influence of that unhappy spirit which so often governs those who feel that they are defending a bad cause, makes free to nickname those who believe in the plain sense of what the Bible declares to us, 'the devil's advocates.' To such he puts this dilemma: 'You are not prepared nor disposed to believe, I dare say, that Peter was the devil. If not, you must admit that Satan has some other meaning attached to it than that of the devil.' (P. 55.) Again, we are told that the Satan who desired to have S. Peter, that he might sift him as wheat, 'signifies, first the maid-servant, and then the others who charged Peter with being a disciple of Jesus Christ, and thus were the means of inducing him to deny His Master'! (P. 56.)

So to the purblind vision of the writer quoted by our lecturer the history of the fall of man seems 'an apologue to designate the placidity of a pastoral, or the activity of an agricultural life.' To the same prejudiced eyes 'the history of Cain and Abel appears to be symbolical of the transition from vegetable to animal sacrifices.' And in the account of the serpent having deceived Eve it is dogmatically declared that 'the reason for employing the serpent for (*sic*) one of the actors in the fable

'is evident.' Namely—could the reader have ever guessed it?—'to render more conspicuous the folly and absurdity of serpent worship, which had become very prevalent among the 'heathen nations!' (P. 60.)¹ True, indeed, as Mr. Walter Scott observes concerning this odd jumble of his namesake, Mr. Russell Scott: 'There are few things . . . more calculated to 'prove that the existence of evil spirits is clearly taught in the 'Scriptures, than to find those who deny it obliged to have 'recourse to such desperate methods to maintain their sentiments.'

'There can be no doubt'—the Congregational lecturer elsewhere says—'that the Seed of the woman meant Jesus Christ. 'He was not an allegorical personage. Had He nothing to 'contend with, but an allegorical enemy?' (P. 64.) This leads us at once to our main object in detaining our readers among figments so ridiculous and fancies so unreasonable. The very persons who are thus ready to explain away all the rest of the Bible are, usually, not very averse from explaining away the gospels also. These men, after allegorising the fall, and the temptation, and every other supernatural event in the Holy Scriptures, which they can get into their net, will seldom rest satisfied until they have woven the spider's web around the truth of the history of our blessed Lord. Thus, in opposition to the Congregational lecturer and to everybody who deserves the name of Christian, these people, left to themselves, are not unlikely to fall into the train of Strauss and others, and to maintain that Jesus Christ is an allegorical personage—so far, at least, as we are concerned with Him.

We need scarcely point out the consistency of such notions with the theory of the Socinians and other free-thinking professors of Christianity, who deny most facts or doctrines implying supernatural agency. Any one can see how logically the unbelieving premiss leads to the false and blasphemous conclusion. Once allow the fall to be an allegory and the serpent-tempter a myth, and then it seems almost incongruous to persist in holding that the bruising of the serpent's head refers to a real event, and that the seed of the woman is one individual, actual man. Hence the importance of endeavouring to expose theories so flippant and so flimsy as those noticed by our author with just reprobation. As he truly remarks—in reply to one of the unbelieving school, who asserts that to

¹ We subjoin a brief quotation from a work which places the subject in a totally different point of view. 'The most remarkable corroboration, however, of the Mosaic history is to be found in those fables which involve the mythological serpent, and in the worship which was so generally offered to him throughout the world.'—Deane 'On the Worship of the Serpent' (sec. ed.), p. 32.

'consider the Book of Job in any other light than as an allegory, 'would be to give up all title to common sense'¹—the mere supposition of Job being a fictitious being destroys all the force of most of those passages in Scripture where that patriarch is mentioned. Especially referring to S. James v. 11, our author asks where would be the force of the argument, if it only meant 'Ye have heard of the patience of a *fictitious being*, and have 'seen the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful and of 'tender mercy.' People might fairly reply: 'What is that to 'us? Ours are real sufferings. We need real patience. Where 'is the force of the apostle's argument?'—Here is 'a very fine 'picture of patience, in an imaginary person called Job:—be ye 'therefore patient amidst your real and protracted sufferings. 'What motives can this present to our minds?' (P. 73.)

Were the present a *thinking*, as well as a *reading* age, it would seem labour lost to dwell upon absurdities of this kind, which are scarcely more *plausible* even than they are *reasonable*. But so long as these idle moths and butterflies of infidelity are distracting the attention of men who shrink from the trouble of thinking for themselves, they deserve to be caught and broken on the wheel of criticism. We shall finish our exposure of the strange shifts to which modern Sadducees are driven, when they venture to deny the existence of unclean spirits, by abridging the conclusion of Walter Scott's argument against these gain-sayers drawn from the same book—the Book of Job. Even if it were an allegory and not a history, still, he argues, its allusions, as elsewhere in Holy Scripture, would be to real facts and to real beings. Thus 'the existence of Satan is just as 'much supposed here, as the existence of God, or of men, or of 'marauders, or of storms and diseases. Russell Scott thinks 'that the term Satan (adversary) is an appellative, and that it 'includes the Sabæans and Chaldæans, and the wind, and the fire, 'and the leprosy, all of which are dramatically represented as 'the enemies of Job. This is ridiculous: it implies a violation 'of even all dramatic laws, as well as of the principles of truth 'and nature. Could the robbers, and winds, and fire, and 'leprosy, be represented as appearing before God *amongst his* 'sons?—as being asked by Him whether they had considered 'His servant Job?—as intimating doubts respecting the sincerity 'of his piety?—as moving God against him to destroy him?—as 'daring God to put forth His hand, and touch all that he had?

¹ It would be amusing, were it not so sad, to observe how quietly these enemies of creeds and foes to dogmatism set down as simpletons all who differ from them! But, as no mean authority has lately said, '*Human opinion is as dogmatic as revelation.*' (Pusey's Comm. on Minor Prophets: Amos ii. 4.)

‘—as going out from the presence of the Lord and smiting Job with sore boils? How ineffably absurd!’ (Pp. 75, 76.)

And what blind presumption, what strange infatuation, in men professing to be wiser than their neighbours, to waste their time and talents in conceiving and in publishing these vain and prurient imaginations, by which the written Word of God is made ridiculous and of none effect!

The character, state, and powers of evil spirits are discussed at some length by Walter Scott, after having detailed and refuted the wild theories of those who deny that there are any evil spirits. We shall not enter very deeply into this part of the subject, although we can conscientiously recommend what he has written to the perusal of the Christian student. One observation antagonistical to the fearfully prevailing worship of intellect may, possibly, command more attention, as coming from a Congregationalist than if it came from ourselves. After remarking of the evil angels that, ‘perhaps the united intellect of hundreds of mortals would not equal that of the superior ranks, especially of their leader,’ he elsewhere repeats the axiom that ‘knowledge is power,’ and asserts that ‘it must be so in the case of the evil spirits.’ But then he remarks that ‘sin is always unfavourable to mental improvement, and that it always perverts the moral judgment and affections, and weakens the moral powers,’ yet ‘does not enervate the intellectual faculties.’ ‘How often,’ he adds, ‘do we find superior mental abilities connected with a most depraved heart and vicious life; almost the powers and acquirements of an angel, with the temper and conduct of a fiend!’ (Pp. 105, 116, 117.) And yet mere intellect—untamed, unsanctified by any higher or better powers than its own—is the fashionable object of worship, the darling idol, of the present age. An age in which it might be said with some appearance of truth, that, if the superficial extent covered by intellectual pretensions was never greater, the solid cubic measure of its real depth was never less. An example of this—the first which occurs to us—may be found in a book lying open before us, which we have had occasion to consult on the present subject.¹ The Socinian gloss upon the fact recorded by S. Mark that our blessed Saviour had cast out of Mary Magdalene seven devils is as follows: *i.e.* ‘whom Jesus had cured of raving madness. So Celsus understood the expression. See Farmer on Dem. p. 105.’ Were ever such shallow pretensions to learning and correct interpretation put forth? As if *Celsus* were an authority for Christian interpretation of the things of the spiritual world! And this

¹ ‘Improved Version of the New Testament.’ (Socinian.) Note on Mark xvi. 9.

is but a sample of 'popular intellect'—at least, in religious matters. We remember once meeting with a really thoughtful and able clergyman, who said that, whenever the tide of opinion was setting in very strongly against any of the great doctrines or universal customs of Christ's Church, he always found comfort and encouragement from reading a certain commentary by a clever, popular, hasty writer of the day. 'If such be popular 'divinity,' he argued—'so shallow, so empty—no wonder that 'the witness of the Church to the teaching of the Bible is 'despised and lightly treated!' So, after all, if intellect be our idol just now, it may be but a feeble and helpless object of worship.

There are several interesting observations of our lecturer, which deserve notice, but we must hasten on to more general inferences and assertions concerning the agency of evil spirits. Only we must give the meed of praise his ingenuity and good sense deserve for the quiet but striking way in which he disposes of that great stumbling-block in the way of certain persons, we mean the doctrine of eternal punishment. In more passages than one Mr. Walter Scott implies—most truly—that, unless we can deny the possibility of sinners being *incorrigible*, we must allow the necessity of the punishment of their sin being *eternal*, or else contradict all our moral ideas respecting the Divine attributes.

The subjects of witchcraft and magic, in connexion with what is stated on these subjects in Holy Scripture, are entered into very fully by the author of the Lectures before us. When he comes down to the days of the 'Puritan Fathers,' as he calls them, it requires a little tact and dexterity on his part to get over this chapter in the history of witchcraft without showing up in too strong colours such men as Baxter, Cotton Mather, or 'the infamous Hopkins'—the notorious witchfinder. To the latter our author shows, indeed, very little mercy, and he is made a sort of scapegoat for the rest of the Puritans. The others, however, are dealt with more leniently, and from the simple premiss that Baxter believed in witchcraft, the following old conclusion is drawn in rather more of a puritanical tone than this writer commonly indulges. 'Lord, what is man!' he exclaims; 'verily, every man in his best estate is, in every respect, altogether vanity.' Too true, no doubt, but surely a truth rather far-fetched, when deduced from Richard Baxter's belief in witchcraft!

But Mr. Walter Scott's treatment of this period of 'witch-finding,' when Presbyterianism bore sway, demands a little closer attention; and we think we can supply his narrative with a few additional facts, which he must have known, and ought

not to have omitted. We wonder how many pages in the Congregational Lecture would have been taken up with diatribes against 'persecution,' 'bigotry,' and 'intellectual darkness,' if Hopkins, the witch-finder, had been an 'Episcopalian;' or if poor old Lewis, who was hanged as a wizard, after having been about fifty years vicar of Brandiston, in Suffolk, had been a *rebel*, instead of a *royalist*, a *ranting*, instead of 'a *reading parson*;' and had had Archbishop Laud, instead of 'Mr. Calamy, present with the judges on the circuit, to see that 'there was no fraud or wrong done' the accused! What an opportunity for dwelling on the Church's intolerance and blindness would any Dissenting writer have had, if the following ascending scale of barbarity had ascended with the rise and triumph, not of Dissenting, but of Church principles!—'In 1612, fifteen indicted' for witchcraft 'at Lancaster, and twelve condemned; 1622, six tried at York; 1634, seventeen condemned in Lancashire; 1644, sixteen executed at Yarmouth; 1645, fifteen condemned at Chelmsford and hanged; in the same and following year, about forty at Bury, in Suffolk, twenty more in the county, and many at Huntingdon;¹ and 'according to the estimate of Ady, some thousands were burnt in Scotland.' (*Retrosp. Review*, vol. v. p. 114.) Now we are quite prepared to take our full share in the shame that attaches to such doings, but we must beg leave to draw the attention of our Dissenting brethren to these and other similar facts, in the hope that it may moderate the warmth of their prejudices against the bigotry and persecuting spirit of the Church. Alas! whenever we hear the stern Nonconformist, with a sardonic smile, enlarging upon the intolerance of mitred men and crowned heads, we cannot help thinking of the poet's question:—

'Quid rides? mutato nomine de te
Fabula narratur.'

Again, if we follow our lecturer across the Atlantic, we shall find him still disposed to deal rather too gently with those Pilgrim Fathers and their children, whose degenerate descendants have now so generally become either Socinians or 'Episcopalians.' 'Even in New England,' we are told, 'mournful as was the tragedy that was acted there, it is evident that the piety and good sense of the descendants of the Puritan Fathers rendered the scene less gloomy than it would otherwise have been. Had it not been for these, instead of sixteen months and nineteen executions, the withcraft mania might have continued for years, and sacrificed hundreds of victims. It is not neces-

¹ The result is worth attending to. In three or four years at least one hundred persons put to death for witchcraft, in only four counties, and those all four 'associated counties,' to say nothing of the fires lit in Scotland!

'sary to enlarge:' (p. 189)—and yet we are strongly tempted to do so! But it shall only be with one question. What Dissenters would accept this evidence of any Christian community (but their own) abounding in 'piety and good sense,' that they were crazy for sixteen months, and not for years, and that they murdered only nineteen persons, instead of 'sacrificing hundreds of victims'?

In concluding this digression, we willingly appeal from the Walter Scott, with whom we are at present concerned, to another author of the same name, and better known to fame, who has stated the case, in our opinion, much more fairly. Sir Walter Scott speaks sensibly and impartially, and acknowledges (as all parties must) that 'the witchcraft mania' was quite in accordance with 'the spirit of the age' in which it so extensively prevailed. But he does not hesitate to assert that the popular religionists of the day were the most severely bitten by this mania. He speaks boldly, in one passage, of 'the numberless extravagances of the Scottish Dissenters of the seventeenth century, now canonized in a lump by those who view them in the general light of enemies to Prelacy.' Elsewhere he avers, that 'the ministers of the Church of England, though less prone to prejudice than those of other sects, are yet far from being entirely free of encouraging in particular instances the witch superstition.' But, in Sir Walter Scott's opinion, 'On the whole, the Calvinists, generally speaking, were, of all the contending sects, the most suspicious of sorcery, the most undoubting believers in its existence, and the most eager to follow it up with what they conceived to be the due punishment of the most fearful of crimes.' Thus, 'the most severe of the laws against witchcraft originated with a Scottish king of England'—the only extensive persecution following that statute was when the Calvinists were, for a short time, in full power. So that 'the temporary superiority of the Presbyterians in England was marked by enormous cruelties of this kind.'¹

But to return from *Sir* Walter to *Mr.* Walter Scott. This last gentleman truly asserts that 'the belief in witchcraft has been degrading and pernicious.' If we had time to spare, we fancy we could corroborate this assertion by tracing its degrading and pernicious effects most prominently in the history of those who held most firmly and acted most fiercely on this very belief, as it was popularly held by men pretending to monopolise all the religion of their day. It was a Presbyterian rule recommended to Wodrow to leave out 'what is merely

¹ See Sir W. Scott's 'Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft.' Letter VIII. NO. CXVII.—N.S. D

‘circumstantial, except where it is necessary for illustrating the ‘matter, or *aggravating the crimes of our enemies*.’¹ We fear Mr. Walter Scott has deemed it lawful to do something of this sort, in the matter of witchcraft, for diminishing the (comparative) innocence of his adversaries. We sincerely wish that all Christian controversialists were quite clear from any suspicion of this kind. Or supposing that to be impossible, we wish it were, at least, confined to followers of Ignatius Loyola and Protestant Dissenters.

From the agency of evil spirits, real or imaginary, in cases of witchcraft, our author proceeds to consider the Sibylline verses and the heathen oracles in connexion with such agency. And if his discussion of this part of his subject is not very original nor full of depth, still it is worth reading, and may at least *instruct*, though it may not *convince* many. In truth, this writer appears scarcely to have made up his own mind upon many points in this difficult matter, and he certainly does not, generally speaking, dogmatise upon it, but endeavours rather to place candidly before his readers different theories and views. One exception, perhaps, to his usual candour, is the way in which he treats the Fathers—of whom, nevertheless, he once or twice speaks very highly indeed. We believe that great allowances must be made for a Nonconformist writer in these cases, and that the very words of S. Jerome, referred to by another Dissenter, Hugh Farmer, whom Mr. Walter Scott quotes, will apply to the Nonconformists much more closely than to the Fathers: ‘*Quia interdum coguntur loqui, non quod sentiunt, sed quod necesse est.*’ Evidently our lecturer has a mind and a heart capable of appreciating, in some degree, Christian antiquity. And, not less evidently, he felt that a Congregational lecturer could not afford to venture too far upon this—to him—dangerous ground. A few extracts will best serve to throw light upon our meaning, and to illustrate the anomalous position of a Dissenter at all versed in ecclesiastical antiquity and of ingenuous mind:—

‘The Fathers,’ he says, ‘with all their defects, were a pious, noble, devoted class of men. With how much heartiness did they embrace the religion of the cross! How firmly did they believe it!² How fearlessly did they advocate its cause! How did they, in some respects, adorn it by their lives! How ready were they to die on its behalf! How certain is it that they are now receiving the reward promised to those who confessed Christ before men! Well would it be for their successors in the present day, if, in addition to their more extensive and accurate knowledge, they had the heartiness, and zeal, and faith of these ancient supporters of the Christian religion. I am far from joining with those who despise and revile them, and are disposed to think that it would be

¹ See Bishop Russell’s ‘History of the Church in Scotland,’ Vol. ii. page 250, note.

² “How,” asks the Congregational Lecturer, “can we reject their statements, without undermining all testimony as a ground of faith?”

well for the cause of religion and of the church, if all their writings were blotted out from existence.¹—Pp. 224, 225.

Thus far we cordially agree with our author, and cannot but admire his candour; for whatever good the Patristic writings may do to the cause of religion and the Church,¹ we doubt very much their greatly serving the cause of the meeting-house. Probably Dr. Bennett—another Congregational lecturer, of whom our readers know something—was more true to his dissenting theory, when, instead of praising the Fathers, he declares, unequivocally, that ‘There is scarcely an error in doctrine, or corruption in practice, or superstition in worship, by which the church was ever troubled, that may not be traced to very early times, and that was not defended by some venerated name.’ (Bennett’s *Cong. Lectures*, p. 263.)

And Mr. Walter Scott, notwithstanding all that he says in behalf of the Fathers, speaks—from habit or necessity, we presume—rather slightly of them, when he comes to consider their witness about the heathen oracles. ‘With all their excellencies,’ according to him, ‘some of them were weak men, and all of them superstitious.’ (P. 225.) Nay, in a note in the Appendix (K.), the lecturer quotes Hugh Farmer and Conyers Middleton in proof of it having been ‘shown only too clearly that the Fathers are not entitled to the praise of even sincerity and honesty.’ How it can be ‘certain’ that, though not ‘sincere and honest,’ they are ‘now receiving the reward promised to those who confessed Christ before men,’ he does not explain. And we cannot.

In treating of the difficult subject of the heathen oracles,² our author is more diffuse and laborious than successful. In spite of such authorities as Conyers Middleton, Hugh Farmer, and Isaac Taylor, proving the Fathers to have been ‘not only superstitious and easily deceived, but quite capable of practising

¹ We print ‘Church’ with a capital. The Congregationalists seem to prefer a small initial letter.

² The reader will, perhaps, excuse, for its own sake, the following quotation:—

‘Spartano cuidam respondit Pythia vates,
Haud impunitum quondam fore, quod dubitaret
Depositum retinere, et fraudem jure tueri
Jurando; quærebat enim quæ numinis esset
Mens; et an hoc illi facinus suaderet Apollo
Reddidit ergo metu, non moribus, et tamen omnem
Vocem adyti dignam templo, veramque probavit,
Extinctus totâ pariter cum prole domoque,
Et quamvis longâ deductis gente propinquis,
Has patitur pœnas peccandi sola voluntas.
Nam scelus intra se tacitum qui cogitat ullum
Facti crimen habet.’—(Juv. Sat. xiii.)

Such specimens of heathen oracles tend to make the question whence they proceeded doubly perplexing.

imposition' (p. 230, n.), the lecturer's arguments against what they state are uncommonly poor and feeble. For example, he argues that the oracle at Delphi must have been managed by the craft of man, because 'surely Satan, had he been permitted, could have managed things better than' they were managed. (P. 209.) So, no doubt, Satan, had he been permitted, could have managed things better for his own purpose by killing holy Job at once, and thus defrauding all succeeding ages of his glorious prophecy of the Messiah and pattern of patience. The reply in both cases is obvious. *He was not permitted.* So again, under the treacherous guidance of men like Conyers Middleton, our author sometimes ventures, in this part of his subject, upon a line of argument which scarcely seems consistent with certain facts recorded in Holy Scripture. At page 226, when he contradicts the Fathers with Jesus Christ and His Apostles, he appears altogether to ignore what is recorded in Holy Writ about touching the hem of our Lord's garment, or of the effect of S. Peter's shadow passing by, or of the handkerchiefs and aprons of S. Paul. These are just the things which he would not hesitate to call instances of superstition or credulity, if recorded by the Fathers only.

It is rather a hasty assertion that 'we have no evidence that 'God ever permitted any *real* miracle to be performed, or even 'wonder to be exhibited, or true prophecy to be uttered, in 'support of any false religion.' (P. 208.) When we refer to texts like Deut. xiii. 2, Matthew xxiv. 24, and Rev. xiii. 13, and xvi. 14—to pass over a multitude of others—we dare make no such assertion. If we cannot prove that God does permit *real* wonders to be wrought by the powers of evil, we dare not affirm that He does not. Indeed, Mr. Walter Scott, when he comes to consider the circumstances of Christ's temptation, takes (we are happy to say) the right view, though (we are sorry to say) he contradicts himself. For he completely puts aside the theories of Le Clerc, Hugh Farmer, &c., and clings firmly to the literal interpretation of what took place in the temptation. Nay, he notices the objection that this literal sense involves the admission of a certain power in Satan, on certain occasions, of working what we call miracles. Hugh Farmer's objection to the literal interpretation of our Lord's temptation is that 'it ascribes to the devil the performance of the greatest miracles.' To this our author truly replies—though we think his reply contradictory to the assertion we have just quoted—'How limited is our experience! How 'egregiously shall we err, if we make it the measure of all that 'is possible, of all that spirits can do, of all that has been! We 'have no experience of the performance of miracles; but shall

'we therefore conclude that none were ever wrought? This is 'exactly Hume's argument against miracles in general. . . . But 'this objection is founded entirely on Farmer's theory respecting evil spirits, which is by no means granted. It is evident 'from many examples recorded in the Scriptures, that the good 'angels have the power of assuming a visible form, of speaking 'with an audible voice, and of removing bodies from one place 'to another.' 'Doing so,' he continues, 'does not imply a 'miracle in the proper sense of the word.' But we think it does. And Johnson's definition of a miracle (in theology) corroborates our view: 'An effect above human or natural power, performed in attestation of some truth.' In this sense it would indeed be true that evil spirits do no *real* miracle, not because the effect is not *real*, but because it is wrought to prove a falsehood. But this very fact is implied by the expression used of such wonders. They are called *false* miracles, not because they are not really above natural or human power, but because they are worked in order to make men believe a lie. And thus, though actually wrought, they may be but 'strong delusions' after all. The subject is altogether a difficult one, and we pronounce no opinion upon it ourselves. But we must say that the Fathers, whether right or wrong, have treated this difficult subject more consistently than Mr. Walter Scott has.

The Congregational lecturer insists very strongly and properly upon the reality of the demoniacal possessions recorded in Holy Scripture, and takes great pains in replying to Hugh Farmer's theories of a contrary tenor. When we quote one or two of these, by way of specimen, we think our readers will be satisfied. Farmer's favourite doctrines are 'that all cases of 'supposed possessions are only diseases, and that the temptations of Jesus Christ took place in a vision, and that this was 'presented to Him by the Holy Spirit, and not by Satan'! Again, the same writer, trying to account for the fear felt by the unclean spirits that Christ had come to torment them, 'quotes with approbation the sentiments of Wetstein, who supposes that the demoniac was afraid of being *beaten* or *bound*, 'or having some *ungrateful purgative* administered to him.' (Pp. 245, 259.)

From such irreverent trash we gladly turn to a passage, in which Walter Scott forcibly exposes the shallow philosophy—theology we cannot call it—which would shut out either good angels or bad from any intercourse with this lower world—the plain language of Holy Writ notwithstanding. He asks:—

'Who can tell how extensive is the sphere of action allotted to superior beings? Are we warranted to conclude that because man, on account of the grossness of his body, and the influence of the laws of gravitation, is confined

to this earth, that angels, whether good or bad, must be unable to visit various parts of the universe? It is just as if a horse or a sheep, supposing it capable of thought or reflection, were to conclude, that, because it cannot navigate the ocean, and leave the little island in which it is located, therefore no creatures in existence can visit those parts of the earth which are separated by the mighty deep: or as if a shell-fish, were it able to reason, were to conclude, that, because it cannot leave the rock to which it adheres, therefore every living thing must be so confined, and that the law under the influence of which it exists, must be universal.'—P. 246.

We cannot but commend the foregoing quotation to the careful consideration of some of those who are trying to pass for the deep thinkers of the day, and who really themselves believe the delusion which they are passing off upon others!

In this part of his Lectures our author explains more particularly what he deems to be a miracle, viz. what changes or supersedes the great established laws of nature. And he repeats his assertion that neither angels nor devils are able to work miracles: which, probably, is true, if his definition be accepted. According to the better definition we have borrowed from the great lexicographer, we must reiterate our assertion that it is untrue. Even Mr. Scott acknowledges that 'if spirits 'are able to operate upon matter' (which he concedes), 'they 'may be supposed to be able to effect some things which would 'appear to us to be miraculous.' Still he will not allow that they can work *real* miracles, and uses a sort of *à priori* argument that 'God would not suffer any one to forge the great seal in such a 'way as that the imposition could not be detected.' But what if we have been told beforehand of these great signs and wonders? What if we have been already warned not to go after any wonder-workers, saying, 'Lo, here is Christ! or, Lo, He is there!' What, if we are told that, if an apostle, or even an angel from heaven come to us bringing us a new gospel, he is accursed? Even if the miracles were to our limited faculties ever so real, yet need they not, therefore, deceive the elect. Nor would they deceive them. The cause for which they were wrought would be a sufficient test whereby to judge of the power that wrought them. Thus, to borrow the words of our author, 'the wrath of devils, as well as of men, is caused to praise God, and the remainder of it is restrained.' (P. 270.)

We have already alluded to Farmer's hypothesis of our blessed Lord's temptation being only a vision, and we must say that Mr. Walter Scott fully exposes the false and unsatisfactory character of this theory. Space will not allow us to dwell long upon this part of the subject, but we may notice in passing two rather remarkable coincidences. The Congregational lecturer, in the course of his argument, puts the following question: 'What 'right have we to suppose, however it may have been asserted

'by some, and taken for granted by others, that Satan knew in what sense Jesus Christ was the Son of God, or that he was acquainted with the doctrine of His Divinity?' Here the reader will at once recognise one of the three mysteries spoken of by S. Ignatius of Antioch,¹ and it is curious to trace this apparently unconscious following of the Bishop and martyr of the second century by the dissenting teacher of the nineteenth.

Again we recognise, in a quotation from Hugh Farmer, the dissenting teacher of the last century, one of the strange notions—viz. that spirits, or, at least, the evil spirits, have no power over matter—which have proved a nine days' wonder to our sober countrymen in the recent 'Essays and Reviews.' The writers in that extraordinary, but not very original volume, must often have occasion to say, if ever they study the records of ancient heresies, and modern freethinkers:—

'Pereant, qui nostra ante nos dixissent'!

In conclusion, the Congregational lecturer endeavours to draw some practical benefit from his consideration of the agency of evil spirits, and treats of what he calls the most important, though last, part of his subject, viz. the temptations of Satan in their common or ordinary form. The idea is better than the manner of carrying it out. The bitter spirit in which the author speaks of *idolatry* alone, would lead any one who knew no better, to imagine, not that it was *only one* of the manifest works of the flesh, but that it was *the only one*. He seems to forget that such sins as hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions (*δικοστασίαι*), heresies, and others, are just as enticing to man's fallen nature, and just as apt handles of temptation as idolatry itself. It is mere falsehood to assert that soon 'Satan found a more efficient vicegerent in the Man of Sin, than ever he had done in the pagan emperor!' (P. 322.) And were we Romanists, how gladly should we welcome an opponent who came forth to meet us with arguments, or assertions rather, like this!

But Mr. Scott is a Dissenter—Dissenters of course think themselves and their system to be right; and the reverse of what they think must therefore be wrong, so the Romish system is called an antichristian system, and two whole pages are occupied in showing that there are no allurements which unrighteousness could possibly present, not to be found in that system. We are no advocates of the errors of the Church of Rome, and must leave those that are so to defend these against Congregational obloquy. They will find this an easier task to accomplish than when those that 'protest' stand upon higher, better, firmer

¹ Τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς. S. Ignat. ad. Eph. § 19.

ground. But we may, in our turn, protest against the cool assumption of the dissenting lecturer, that 'Baptismal Regeneration' is one of Rome's abominations, intended to allure 'those who did not care to examine whether they were born again, and to labour to enter in at the strait gate.' (P. 323.) This notable assertion figures again, we observe, in Mr. Walter Scott's brief index thus: 'Baptismal Regeneration, a delusion of Satan, 323.' The proof of this is nowhere assayed, unless, indeed, it be proof enough of any doctrine that it is a delusion of Satan to show that the Church of Rome holds it. But this doctrine, though held by Rome, is no peculiarity belonging to that Church's creed any more than the resurrection of the dead or the truth of Holy Scripture is.

If this be one of Rome's abominations, however, it is one that was received and held by the whole Christian Church from the beginning. If it be one of Satan's delusions, it is a delusion that has deceived the very elect in all ages of the Church. And, still more strange, it is the Socinians, Quakers, sceptics, and unbelievers, who have discovered the delusion and rejected the abomination! It is those who denied the Lord that bought them, who have in all ages been foremost in doing despite unto the Spirit of grace bestowed in Holy Baptism.

Possibly it was the latent consciousness of being in the wrong—even on their own principles—which so often both weakens and embitters the theology of Dissenters, that dictated the following passage—a passage which we cheerfully acknowledge is by no means a fair sample of the spirit of that series of 'Congregational Lectures' with which we are now concerned. 'There cannot be a doubt,' it is said, 'that if Puseyism, with its pestilent heresies, destroying the very spirit of the Gospel, should make a little more progress, it will soon have its lying miracles, to subserve the schemes of the crafty, and excite the astonishment of the ignorant and superstitious.¹ Thus it will, in two ways, most effectually answer the ends of Satan: it will counteract and neutralise, in the case of those who embrace it, the influence of the religion of Jesus Christ, and expose it to the sneers of infidels and of the profane, and furnish them with pretexts for altogether rejecting the claims of the Bible.' (P. 361.)

Such ebullitions are much more fitted to awaken the pity than the wrath of every well-trained mind. And even the most zealous Protestants are involved in the same indiscriminate con-

¹ It is now eight years since the date of the new edition of Scott's Lectures, which lies before us, and we cannot think of anything like a fulfilment of this prediction, unless, indeed, it be found (which we do not pretend to say it is) in the recent history of what are called 'Revivals.'—See *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxxix. p. 364.

demnation, not only of Popery, but of whatsoever lies between Popery and Congregationalism. It is said, even of a 'Luther, a Zuingle, and a Knox, and many others,' that 'they could not unravel all these arts of Satan—they could not break through all the trammels in which they were held, and cast off the whole of the yoke which had been imposed on the Church of God, nor escape from all the fascinations of "the deceivableness of unrighteousness!"' (P. 324.) The Socinians might fairly enough apply this lamentation even to the 'Independent Churches' and their leaders!

But we wish not to enter into the matter any further. We think our two last quotations may safely be left to speak for themselves. Supposing the assertion to be true that even 'Luther, Zuingle, Knox, and many others, carried much of the spirit of the antichristian system which they exploded into the Churches which they formed,' and that 'there it remains, to a lamentable extent, to this day, and is operating to produce a retrograde movement'—we seem almost drifted downwards to the inevitable conclusion that all Christian Churches are antichristian. We beg pardon for saying *all*. Of course, the 'Congregational Churches' form an exception!

But we do not mean to part with our author in ill humour. If the reader will bear with us, while we put before him a favourable specimen of the practical lessons the lecturer deduces from his subject, we will then soon release him. Contrasting the inability of Satan now to tempt us personally and visibly, with the way in which he does now tempt us by means of literature, Mr. Walter Scott says—

'How effective a minister of Satan is the learned infidel philosopher, metaphysician, or historian, or the atheistic licentious poet, or the irreligious scoffing novelist, who renders all the stores of his learning, and the creations of his imagination, and the colourings of his fancy, subservient to arraying piety in the garb of enthusiasm, or hypocrisy, or of a contemptible weakness; and heartless licentiousness and cruelty in the attractions of sincerity and ingenuousness and nobleness of spirit! How dreadful the responsibility of those who thus pervert the most valuable gifts of the Father of spirits—of Him who puts knowledge into the heart, and wisdom into the inward parts! How much would the influence of Satan be diminished were he thrown, as it regards every individual, entirely on his own resources and direct attacks! This deserves the attention and grave consideration of all, who, by purchasing and reading such works, and even recommending them, because of the genius and learning of their authors, contribute to preserve them from oblivion, and even to increase their celebrity.'—P. 328.

We had intended to make some brief remarks on two or three rather bold assertions, which our author ventures to make *ex cathedra*, i. e. from the Congregational pulpit. We shall, however, mention but one of these, namely, his incidental assumption that S. Paul's Epistles were 'epitomes of his preaching to

the Gentiles.' This statement is forestalled and refuted in Woodgate's 'Bampton Lectures,' especially in Lecture the Fourth; and it is chiefly for the sake of recommending, at this crisis of our faith, those admirable Lectures to our readers' careful perusal, that we notice the Independent lecturer's hasty notion that S. Paul's Epistles resemble in character the well-known 'Skeletons' of the amiable and indefatigable Charles Simeon!

In reply to the important question, How are we to vanquish our infernal deadly enemies? the lecturer most truly answers—1. By Christ's power, grace, and merit: 2. By keeping our own hearts with all diligence; 3. By continual vigilance; 4. By using all the means of grace. And we do not know that we can conclude better than with the following sober truths and wholesome warnings connected with the subject of the agency of evil spirits:—

'Alas! how much of our security arises from our inability to see and hear our spiritual enemies, the hosts of hell, and from the practical unbelief of which this is the occasion! But we must in this respect, as well as others, "look not at the things which are seen, but at those which are not seen." Whether we believe it or not, the fact is certain—we must overcome them, or else they will vanquish and completely destroy us. There is no medium; none can avoid the conflict. They will attack us; they have attacked us. Let us beware of the extremes of either attributing to Satan everything which is sinful, or nothing; of thinking and speaking as if he were omniscient or omnipresent, or as if we forgot that his knowledge, and power, and activity are fearfully great.' —P. 345.

ART. III.—*Historical Sketch of the Early Literature of the Lord's Prayer.*

THE history of the literature of our Saviour's Prayer is almost coextensive with the history of the Church.

Not, indeed, altogether so. The ecclesiastical writings of the very earliest times were called forth by peculiar circumstances which required them. The Epistle of Clement of Rome, *e.g.* in the first century, was designed to compose the differences, and put an end to the disorder, which prevailed in the Corinthian Church. And the writings of the second century were either directed against the practical hostility of the Roman governors, as the Apologies of Justin Martyr, Quadratus, Aristides, and others, or were intended, as the great work of Irenæus, to meet the speculative errors of the Gnostic heresy, the chief doctrinal opponent of the rising Christian Church. For other writing than what such necessities of the times called forth, no leisure was found by the great minds of those early days. To go out as missionaries into far-distant lands, and spread the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, was the work of the first century. To disseminate this knowledge through the length and breadth of each land thus evangelized; to fill up, as it were, in detail what had only been sketched in outline in the first century, was the work of the second. Thus, to instruct, and train, and direct, and support all who could be brought within the sphere of their influence—this was the work and the joy of the Christians of the earliest times. They had themselves learnt the Gospel of Christ, and felt themselves bound to make others sharers of the light and the blessings which they had received. For this they were empowered and enlightened by the Holy Spirit within; to this they were constrained by the love of their Saviour and Lord.

But from about the beginning of the third century the aspect of things was changed. The Gospel was now more or less widely and fully spread.¹ Christian teachers were now more abundant. And so it was possible, for men who felt themselves called to such a work, to sit down and meditate on the life and words of the Lord, for the benefit of themselves and the instruc-

¹ Tertullian writes, 'Obsessam vociferantur civitatem; in agris, in castellis, in insulis Christianos; omnem sexum, etatem, conditionem, etiam dignitatem, transgredi ad hoc nomen quasi detrimento moerent.'—Apol. ch. i. The same thing is repeated 'Ad Nationes,' ch. i., in almost the same words.

tion of others throughout all time, without any mistrust lest they should be withdrawing from their proper ministerial work, enjoying the luxury of intellectual and spiritual contemplation themselves, while others were dying for lack of that simple food which it was their duty to supply.

And from that time, onward to the present day, the Prayer of our Lord has been the favourite subject for reflection to men of all times, placed under every variety of condition, and possessed of every variety of character and mind. Scarcely any important period of the Church has passed without producing its own commentary on the Lord's Prayer, stamped more or less with the character of the circumstances under which it was written, and of the inner peculiarities of the author by whom it was composed.

Natural, indeed, it was that men should thus address themselves from the first to the work of unfolding, and illustrating, and applying, the meaning of the Lord's Prayer. It was not only that they had here the words of the Saviour, the very expression of God upon earth; this might be said equally of all the Sermon upon the Mount, of which, at least on one occasion of its being delivered, it formed a part. It was more than this. It was that they had here the most perfect form in which to fulfil the highest and most important duty of the Christian life. Using this prayer, they would pray for such things as Christ Himself had taught them they might ask of God. Using it, they would pray in the manner most acceptable to God, for they would be praying in the very words of the Son of God. And further, they had in this (as is shown in the Second Dissertation on the Prayer) a model according to which their own prayers should be framed. And, once more, they had in it a rule for the practical conduct of life. The duties which should be performed, the motives by which they should be actuated, the hopes by which they should be supported in their earthly course, were all involved in the Lord's Prayer. For prayer, if it is to have any reality, must be the correlative and expression of our actual life. And a divine form of prayer, therefore, is really nothing less than a divine rule. What subject, then, could claim a preference over this? How could the mind be more profitably occupied than in endeavouring to fathom as far as possible the depths of the meaning of this Divine Prayer; so as both to enter into it more fully when addressing God in the words of it, and also to apply the truths and lessons involved in it to the conduct of daily life?

The consequences of this multiplicity of writers on the Lord's Prayer are twofold. On the one hand the Prayer, looked at through the medium of the various commentaries upon it, is seen in the

greatest variety of application, and with a more full and many-sided view of its meaning than has been given of any other portion of the words of our Lord. And, reversely, the literature of the Lord's Prayer, regarded historically, supplies, as it were, a long vista, through which may be seen the varying lights and shadows, the ever-changing circumstances and fortunes, of the Church. And it may be said of the literature of the Lord's Prayer, as Professor Stanley says of the English Prayer-Book, that it is a long gallery of ecclesiastical history, which, to be understood and enjoyed thoroughly, absolutely compels a knowledge of all the greatest names and events of all periods of the Christian Church. In the course of an historic review of the various authors who have written on the prayer, not only are their respective treatises on the prayer, with their merits and demerits, advantages and disadvantages, brought before the view, but also the character and personal history of the writers themselves, and so the circumstances of the Church at the period at which they wrote, are brought before the mind in a series of interesting as well as instructive scenes. And, further, some glimpses are afforded of the change which took place from time to time in the ritual of the Church, through the changes which occurred in the use or position of the Lord's Prayer, holding a place, as it did, in the services of public and private worship, from very early times.

Accordingly, there are two ways of treating the examination of the Prayer. Either it may be examined critically and theologically, the Prayer itself being kept essentially as the main subject in view, and all the light being thrown upon it which can be gathered into a centre from the commentaries which have been composed to explain it in various times: or it may be regarded historically, the eye being fixed not so much now on the Prayer itself, as on the writings upon the Prayer, those writings being taken as supplying a more or less complete illustration, from an interesting point of view, of the history of the Christian Church. The subject has been treated in the first mode in the exposition of the Lord's Prayer by Mr. Karlake. We propose ourselves, in the following pages, to pursue the second course, and to give a short sketch of the history of the Church, as illustrated by the history of the literature of the Lord's Prayer. It will not be possible, indeed, within the limits of a single article, to pass all the writers under review, however briefly. We propose, therefore, to confine ourselves, for the present, to those who wrote in the times of the Early Church.

Sketch of Tertullian.—It is remarkable that all the first great treatises on the Lord's Prayer proceeded from members of the African Church. Planted originally, according to the tra-

dition preserved in Eusebius,¹ at Alexandria by S. Mark, the Egyptian Church consisted in the third and fourth centuries of a number of Christian communities, dotted about in spots along, or near to, the Mediterranean coast, and also planted in Numidia, and other localities more inland. Foremost among the Churches on the coast was that of Carthage. The subject of Rome, and using the language of her conquerors, Carthage gave birth, in Tertullian, and Cyprian, and Augustine, to writers whose fame rivals that of any writers of the Roman, or even of the whole Western Church. But the peculiarity of its condition has stamped its impress upon the writings which it has produced. The subtlety of the Carthaginian character was blended with the practical sense and force of the Roman. And this union appears in the intricacy, and love of antithesis, and occasional forcing and wresting of the natural meaning of passages and words, which mar the great beauty and power of the works of Tertullian and Augustine. Thus, to take a single instance, Tertullian, arguing that a Christian should not be a soldier, gives as a proof from Scripture, 'Omnem militem Dominus in Petro exarmando discinxit,'—'Our Lord for ever forbad men to be soldiers when He commanded S. Peter to put up his sword into its sheath.'² Tertullian was born at Carthage about the middle of the second century, and was brought up in heathenism, with the licence which heathenism commonly involved.³ He added to the characteristics of the Carthaginian character noticed above, an ardent, passionate temperament,⁴ with the impatience which usually accompanies it;⁵ and this appears throughout in his writings, and led him to extreme views. It is important to realize his position, and the condition of the Church in his time.

His Times.—Converted to Christianity, though in what way is unknown, and ordained a presbyter of the Church, he looked with horror from his new state on the conduct of the heathen world. Deep accordingly was his indignation at finding Christians, under one excuse or another, mixing, through the laxity which a time of peace had produced, in the customs of the heathen around them, or engaged in trades which supplied the requisites for heathen licentiousness or idolatry. And deeper still was his grief to find some even selected to hold office in the ministry of the Church who had applied themselves to such unlawful occupa-

¹ Euseb. Ch. Hist. book II. ch. xvi.

² De Idol. ch. xix.

³ 'Hac et nos aliquando risimus. De vestris fuimus. Fiunt non nascuntur Christiani.'—Apol. ch. xviii.

⁴ 'Acris et vehementis ingent.'—Jerome Catal.

⁵ De Patientiâ, ch. i.

tions.¹ In opposing these evils he writes with all the ingenuity and earnestness which naturally belonged to him. He withdraws the veil from the customs of the heathen to show the true character of the things in which Christians were taking part. Excepting that of the Roman satirist, there is nowhere to be found a more powerful exhibition of the iniquity of the unchristianised world than is given in his treatise on the public shows. Most forcibly does he point out, for example, the turbulence and immodesty of the theatres,² and the fierce and cruel passions which the scenes of the amphitheatre called forth.³ And perhaps no passage can be found which more powerfully appeals to men to abstain as Christians from scenes by which they may be led into sin, however much there may be of good intermixed with them, than the following, in which the evils of attending the heathen theatres are denounced:—

‘What would you do if found in such a place? Not as though you would suffer anything from the hands of men. No one would recognise you as a Christian. But think how your conduct is viewed in heaven. Can you doubt that, at the moment when you are present in the congregation of Satan, all the angels are watching you from above, and are noting accurately, one by one, who utters blasphemy, who listens to it, who is lending his tongue, who his ear, to the service of the devil against God? Will you not, then, fly from those seats on which sit arranged the adversaries of Christ? Fly from those chambers of abominations, where the very air which broods heavily over your heads is polluted with words of guilt. You will say that there is much that is pleasant, and entertaining, and harmless at the theatre; nay, that there are some things even most proper to be seen. Be it so. No one mixes up his poison in gall and hellebore, but in sweet and savoury cakes, and so introduces the poisonous drug amid the sweets. And the devil does the same. For he mixes up the deadly poison which he makes in the most pleasant and acceptable of the things of God.’⁴

It would have been well if he had confined himself to efforts for checking in this way any laxity or errors existing in the Church. But he could not be content with this. The strictness of life which he required of Christians drew upon him the

¹ ‘*Alleguntur in ordinem ecclesiasticum artifices idolorum. Pro scelus! Semel Judæi Christo manus interlerunt; isti quotidie corpus ejus lacessunt.*’—*De Idol.* ch. vii.

² *Ibid.* ch. xvi.

³ *Ibid.* ch. xvii.

⁴ *De Spectaculis*, ch. xxvii. Compare the very powerful passage a little earlier in the same treatise, beginning, ‘*An ille*,’ ch. xxv.

ill-will of the clergy, as the words of S. Jerome would seem to imply. And hence he may have been led to seek elsewhere for that strictness of life and that sympathy which he could not find in the Church. And such a refuge offered itself at this time. Montanus, a native of Phrygia, had formed a separate community, professing (though, it would seem, only professing)¹ a greater degree of sanctity than appeared in the members of the Catholic Church. And in such a community the spirit of Tertullian found for a time a congenial sphere. Accordingly he withdrew from the communion of the Church, after having been a member of it only, as it would seem, for about five years.² Afterwards he withdrew even from the Montanist communion, and formed a distinct society of his own.³ Thus he deprived the Church of the benefit which his powerful intellect and earnest character were calculated to bestow. Thenceforth his history is for the most part lost to us; but his works remain, monuments of the history, and character, and ability of the man.

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—Such was the first writer on the Lord's Prayer. His treatise on it, written (it is thought) pretty certainly before he adopted Montanist views, and passed out of the communion of the Catholic Church,⁴ will well repay perusal. But it is unsuited for ordinary readers; for the great condensation of Tertullian's style, and his abrupt transitions from point to point, make it difficult to catch his meaning. Nor can any translation, however well executed, adequately represent the force of his original words. His treatise, accordingly, is one for the student and theologian, and should be carefully studied by them. In the brief pregnant comments on each portion of the Prayer, they will find much material for thought; short heads of matters suggested by the Prayer, or involved in it, which it will be for them to bring out into greater clearness and fulness, for the edification of others and themselves. It is published in the original Latin in the second part of Tertullian's works, edited by E. T. Leopold, and published by Tauchnitz, at Leipsic, in 1839. And in the translation of the Library of the Fathers it forms part of the first volume of Tertullian's works.

History of Cyprian.—Every student in his rambles in the neighbourhood of Cambridge has most probably experienced 'one walk and one day when, looking towards Ely from some

¹ See passage in Eusebius, v. 18, quoted from Apollonius.

² See Preface to Tertullian in 'Lib. of the Fathers,' Tertullian, vol. i. p. ii.

³ 'Yet, we know not on what grounds, retaining those points of discipline which had originally recommended themselves to him, he separated from the Montanists, and formed a small local communion of his own.'—Ibid. p. iii.

⁴ See the evidence in favour of this given at the beginning of the Treatise in the 'Library of the Fathers.'

' of the neighbouring heights, he has seen the dark blue monotonous lump which her ancient and magnificent cathedral heaves against the sky, suddenly burst forth distinctly into all its rich variety of tower, lantern, and galilee; and with such liquid clearness as to place him as it were on the spot. He might have watched with renewed delight several successive alternations of such obscurity and brightness ever as the sun broke forth with a vivid gleam, until at last a storm has suddenly come on and swept the whole object from view. Similar are the glimpses he will have of the African Church from the ground of Ecclesiastical History. He will see her suddenly emerge from the general obscurity in three bright bursts of distinctness, owing to the glory of her three illustrious sons, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine. After the last of these she is lost to his eyes for ever, in darkness, storm, and confusion.'¹

Such is the way in which the excellent biographer of the Early Church opens his notice of Cyprian, the next great writer on the Lord's Prayer. Born at Carthage, like Tertullian, just about fifty years after him, *i.e.* at the beginning of the third century, he was brought up to the profession of a rhetorician, and was not converted to Christianity till about his forty-fifth year,² when he added the name of Cæcilius to his former title of Thascius Cyprian, in honour of the friend to whom he owed his conversion. Once a member of the Church, he was soon ordained deacon and priest, and before he had attained the age of fifty he was chosen to be Bishop of Carthage, by the general desire of the people, but much against his own will, 'His signal merit being regarded as a warrant for dispensing with the Apostolical warning against such promotions of recent converts' (1 Tim. iii. 5).³

His Times.—But his lot was cast in troubled times. A long rest from persecution of nearly fifty years, joined to the natural tendency of the Carthaginian character, had produced its usual fruit of corruption in the Carthaginian Church. To the licence of which Tertullian had complained, was now added a spirit of insubordination and disobedience to the Church's rule. And the persecutions of the Christians under Decius, in the middle of this century, brought these evils out. Numbers yielded to the requisition that they should deny Christ, and either actually offered incense to heathen gods, or accepted a certificate from the magistrate to the effect that they had so conformed, although

¹ Evans, *Biog. of the Early Church*, vol. ii. p. 135.

² A.D. 245 or 246.

³ Robertson's *History of the Church*, vol. i. p. 108.

they had not really done so.¹ And equally difficult to deal with was the case of those who yielded, and that of those who stood firm. For the lapsed, as they were termed, had denied Christ, and had lost, with their uprightness, their position and self-respect. And the martyrs were in danger of losing their humility through the honours paid to them for their steadfastness in the cause of Christ. They were in danger too of being induced to confer too indiscriminately those 'pardons,' or recommendations to the merciful consideration of the Church, which, according to the custom of the times, their own superior merit entitled them to bestow on their weaker brethren. And Cyprian stands before our view, dealing wisely with these and other difficulties. His character was well suited to the times, combining as it did, in an unusual degree, the qualities of firmness, discretion, and love. Opposed to him was the hostility of a faction in his Church, headed by one Novatus, a member of a party to whom his election to the episcopate had been distasteful from the first. But he maintained his position firmly against his opponents, however they might shift their ground. For at one time they were for pardoning too readily the errors of the brethren, and then Cyprian maintained the necessity of preserving the discipline of the Church, and not receiving into communion lightly those who had lapsed. And when, by a change of position, they represented these errors as incapable of being pardoned by the Church, he opposed equally this undue severity. At the same time, he wisely discriminated the circumstances under which men fell, and made due allowance for the weakness which led to their fall. Thus wisely and diligently superintending his Church, Cyprian continued Bishop for about twelve or thirteen years.² In the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Valerian, he was put to death, the great martyr bishop of the Carthaginian Church. He had been banished at first for a time by the Proconsul Paternus to Curubis, which Gibbon describes as 'A free and maritime city of Zeugitania, in a pleasant situation, in a fertile territory, and at the distance of about forty miles from Carthage.'³ But Galerius Maximus, who succeeded Paternus as Proconsul, ordered Cyprian to be recalled from exile, and brought before him. The description of the trial is thus given in the Proconsular Acts. 'On another day, the 18th of the Kalends of October, a great crowd was collected early at Sexti,⁴ as the Proconsul commanded. And the same day Cyprian was

¹ Hence they were called *Libellatics*, as those who had actually sacrificed were called *Sacrificates*.

² Till about 260, A.D.

³ Ch. xvi.

⁴ Sexti is placed about four or six miles from Carthage.

'brought before him, as he sat for judgment in the court called 'Sauciolum.¹ The Proconsul demanded, "Are you Thascius 'Cyprianus?" Cyprian Bishop answered, "I am he." Galerius 'Maximus Proconsul said, "The most sacred emperors have 'commanded you to conform to the Roman rites." Cyprian 'Bishop answered, "I refuse to do so." Galerius, "Take heed 'for yourself." Cyprian, "Execute the emperor's orders; in a 'matter so manifest I may not deliberate." Galerius, after 'briefly conferring with his judicial council, with much reluctance pronounced the following sentence. "You have long 'lived an irreligious life, and have drawn together a number of 'men bound by an unlawful association, and professed yourself 'an open enemy of the gods of the religion of Rome, and the 'pious, most sacred, and august emperors, Valerian and 'Gallienus, have in vain endeavoured to bring you back to 'conformity with their religious observances. Whereas, then, 'you have been apprehended as principal and ringleader in 'these infamous crimes, you shall be made an example to those 'whom you have wickedly associated with you: the authority 'of the law shall be ratified in your blood." He then read the 'sentence of the court from a written tablet. "It is the will 'of this court that Thascianus Cyprianus be immediately 'beheaded."² Cyprian Bishop said, "Thanks be to God."

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—The gentle, loving, and devout spirit of Cyprian breathes in his treatise on the Lord's Prayer. It has a special interest as having been written probably during the visitation of the plague, which, to use the words of Gibbon, 'ragged without interruption in every province, every city, and almost every family of the Roman Empire, from 250 to 265."³ If the treatise was written at this time, it would have a special force, as the thoughts of Christians would be more readily turned to the duties and consolations of religion through the dangers both from persecution and from pestilence by which they were surrounded. And if it came before the notice of the heathen, they may have been induced to give attention to a Christian treatise by the conduct which the Christians exhibited during the time of the plague, and the contrast to the indifference of the heathen presented by the zeal and charity of Christian love.

The chief part of it is given in the Appendix at the end of Mr. Karslake's book. And no one who will be at the pains to read the passages which explain the several petitions of the prayer, taking

¹ Sauciolum was the Criminal Court.

² Proconsular Acts given in Library of the Fathers. Vol. containing Cyprian's Treatises, p. 21.

³ Hist. ch. x. end.

the passage on one petition at morning or evening, day by day, in the manner suggested in another place,¹ can fail to benefit by meditation on Cyprian's words. He will find his understanding enlightened as to the meaning of each portion of the Prayer, and as to the practical lessons taught in it. And his whole spirit will be incited to offer the Prayer in a more real and hearty way. The treatise of Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer may be regarded also as comprehending much of what is valuable in that of his predecessor Tertullian. For Cyprian was a diligent student of Tertullian's works. Daily he read some portion of them: and, when asking for the works of Tertullian from his amanuensis, his common expression is reported to have been, 'Da Magistrum,' 'Give me my Master.' And hence it cannot be doubted that, before writing on the Lord's Prayer himself, he would specially have made himself familiar with what had been written on it by the earlier commentator. The two treatises are, indeed, quite distinct and independent in matter, as well as in character and style. But still passages occur in Cyprian which agree with corresponding passages in Tertullian in a way which can hardly be accidental. Such, *e.g.* is the application which they both make of the parable of the rich man in reference to the petition for our daily bread. It may be well to give the words of both for the sake of those who cannot readily obtain access to the original works. 'But with good cause,' writes Tertullian, 'hath He added, "give us this day," "seeing that He has said before, "take no thought for the morrow what ye shall eat." To which matter He hath also applied the parable of that man who, when his fruits were coming in, "thought within himself of building greater barns," and of times for long "taking his ease." On that very night he dieth.'² With this compare the words of Cyprian: 'Wherefore also God judges that rich fool, whose thoughts were for his earthly stores, and who boasted himself in the multitude of his abundant gatherings, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" The fool made merry in his stores, even that night he was to die; and while life was ceasing from his hand, life's multiplied provision still employed his thought. The Lord, on the other hand, teaches us that he becomes the perfect and accomplished Christian, who, by selling all he has, and giving to the poor, stores up for himself a treasure in heaven.'³ The treatise is published in the original Latin in the second part of Cyprian's works, edited by Goldhorn, and published at Leipsic by Tauchnitz in 1839.

¹ In the Dissertation on the Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer.

² De Orat. sec. 6.

³ Treatise vii. sec. 14.

History of Origen.—Somewhat earlier than Cyprian, who has been placed next to Tertullian, as belonging like him to the Carthaginian Church, was Origen, a third great writer on the Lord's Prayer.¹ Unlike Cyprian, he was brought up in Christianity from his youth. His father was a Christian; and, before his son was quite seventeen, he was put to death in the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Severus. Thus Origen was left with his mother and six brothers in a state of utter destitution, all the property of his father being confiscated to the State.² The earnest zeal of Origen showed itself even at this early age. He longed to offer himself as a martyr for the Christian cause; and being prevented by the care of his mother from doing this, he wrote to his father, strongly inciting him to martyrdom, and urging him not to deny the Christian faith for the sake of saving the family dependent on him. 'Take care,' he writes, 'not to change your mind on our account.'³ After his father's death he diligently continued the studies which he had all along pursued under his father's care. And hence he was counted fit to hold an important position in the Church when he was now only about eighteen years of age.

His Position and Times.—The catechetical school of Alexandria had been founded some little time before this. It was designed as a place for instruction in the principles of Christianity, and more particularly for the instruction of those who were brought over from heathenism to the Christian faith. Hence it was more especially important that those who presided over it should be conversant not only with Scripture, but also with heathen literature as well. It was to this position that Origen was appointed now: and his previous training exactly qualified him for the post; for he had been instructed in philosophy by Ammonius Saccas, the great eclectic philosopher of the time, and he had been taught the principles of Christianity by Clement, the second president of the school of Alexandria, of which Origen himself was now to be the head. And if Cyprian stands before our eye more as the gentle moderate administrator of the Church at Carthage, the mind loves to picture Origen rather as presiding over his Alexandrian school. We think of him as sitting, perhaps, day by day, and all day, ready to receive all who came to him for instruction and advice; now, perhaps, surrounded by his group of pupils, now meeting the difficulties, or enlightening the ignorance, of some single disciple. And what a solemn interest must it have given to his teaching, to feel, as he unfolded the great truths of the love of Christ, and

¹ Born about A.D. 185.² Evans, ii. p. 6.³ Ibid. p. 5.

the glories of the future world, that the effect of his teaching on the disciple might be tested as soon as he left his master's school, if some informer should declare the disciple to be a Christian, and so subject him to the hatred and rapacity of the heathen powers.¹

But this pleasing picture vanishes before long. In the course of a journey to Greece he had visited Cæsarea, and had there been ordained priest by the Bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. How they should have been induced to confer on Origen the office which had been withheld by his regular bishop, it is difficult exactly to understand. But an entire change in Origen's position was the consequence of the act. He was compelled to leave Alexandria, and thenceforth we no more think of him as directing his school there. He withdrew to Cæsarea, the great seaport of the coast of Palestine. There he engaged in the superintendence of a school in place of the one which he had left. And there he found, in the friendship of the Bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, some compensation for the loss of the many friends at Alexandria, whom the indiscretion of himself or others made it necessary for him to leave. To his teaching there he added the composition of many works. The most famous of these was his Hexapla. It exhibited in parallel columns the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and the same in Greek letters, together with the Septuagint and three other versions. And hence the name of Hexapla was assigned to it, from its exhibiting four versions of the Hebrew text, together with that text itself in the Hebrew and the Greek form. At Cæsarea he remained till the close of his life in the middle of the third century. In the persecution which raged under the Emperor Decius, and which has already been noticed as afflicting the Carthaginian Church, he was cast into prison among the numbers who suffered at that time. And though he was not actually put to death, he died from the sufferings to which he had been subjected, in his sixty-ninth year.² Possessed of great industry and an earnest ardent character, he has left behind him voluminous works. But his speculations, although striking, want the sobriety and certainty which alone could have given them a permanent value. Indeed, the views of Arius and other erroneous teachers have seemed to be supported by the writings of Origen. And, similarly, his view of Scripture as containing throughout a deeper mystical sense underlying the natural one, takes off from the value of his commentaries on God's Word. But they have their merit notwithstanding. And this has been fully recognised by one of the most careful commentators of our own time. 'Of the Patristic commentators,' writes Dean Ellicott, 'I

¹ Evans, *Life of Origen*, in vol. ii.

² About A.D. 254.

'have derived great benefit from some exceedingly valuable 'annotations of Origen, which are to be found in Cramer's 'Catena, and which have scarcely received any notice from 'recent expositors, though they most eminently deserve it.'¹

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—The treatise of Tertullian on the Lord's Prayer had a special interest as having been written probably before his separation from the Church. And that of Cyprian is associated with the great plague, and the exhibition called forth by it of Christian zeal and love. And the treatise of Origen in the same way has a peculiar interest as forming part of a treatise on prayer, addressed by him apparently to his friend Ambrosius,² together with a Lady Tatiana, of whom nothing more is known, though she has been supposed to be the sister of Ambrosius.³ Ambrosius himself was a man of rank, talent, and fortune, at Alexandria. He had been brought out of the errors of the Gnostic system into the light of the true Gospel by Origen. And from him in turn 'Origen derived not only encouragement in his labours, 'which he had from other quarters, but also, what he most 'needed, pecuniary means for prosecuting his literary undertakings, and what he was shortly to need, a steadfast support in the 'day of trouble.'⁴ There is much that is valuable to be found in the treatise on prayer addressed by Origen to him. And the chapters on the opening address in the Lord's Prayer, and on the petition, 'Lead us not into temptation,' supply many useful suggestions for the explanation and application of the Prayer. But the treatise is quite unsuited as a whole for the general reader: and Mr. Karslake, it will be seen, has thought it best to give only such occasional portions of it in the notes as illustrate or expand the remarks made in his Lectures. The petition, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' naturally gives scope for his tendency to mystical interpretation noticed before. A curious illustration of this mystical mode of explaining Scripture occurs in the sixth chapter of his treatise on the Prayer. Commenting on the words introductory to it in S. Matthew, he says, 'Many 'men pray "to be seen of men," and "stand praying in the 'corners of the broad streets," being lovers of pleasure rather 'than lovers of God. For every one who is devoted to pleasure 'delights to walk in the broad way, and turns aside from the 'strait and narrow way of Jesus Christ, in which are no turnings 'and corners to be found.'

¹ Ellicott. Comm. on the Ep. to the Ephesians. Preface, p. viii.

² See ch. i. end.

³ So the Editor in his Preface to the curious early Oxford edition of the Treatise on Prayer, Preface, p. vi.

⁴ Evans, Biog. vol. ii. p. 26.

History of Augustine.—Of the next three great writers on the Lord's Prayer—Augustine, Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nyssa—Augustine, strictly speaking, should be placed last. But as he was so nearly contemporary with the other two, it will be best to place him next in order, as belonging, like the three preceding writers, to the African Church. Of his early personal history, unlike that of the earlier writers, we have very full details. They are too well known to be recited at any length here. But even those most familiar with them, may be willing to have the outlines of his early life recalled to their mind. Born at Thagasta, a city of Numidia, between Madaura and Hippo, in the year 354 A.D., he was taught at first in the neighbouring town of Madaura, and then sent to complete his studies at Carthage in his seventeenth year. From that time he lived an unsettled life. From Carthage he returned, on his father's death, to his native town; and thence he again returned to Carthage, and established a school there, on the loss of a friend whom he had dearly loved. From Carthage again he went to Rome; and from thence to Milan, where the great and good Ambrose was bishop at the time. This was the turning point of his life. At Milan he became a Christian indeed. He returned thence to Africa; and went to Hippo, which was near (as was said before) to his native town. There he was ordained Presbyter; and he was soon made Coadjutor to the Bishop of Hippo, in his forty-first year, A.D. 395. As Bishop of Hippo he remained for five and thirty years, till the close of his life in 430 A.D., his seventy-sixth year, 'having remained faithful' (as Dean Milman writes,) 'to his earliest, though humble see.' Some years before his death, Rome had been taken by the Goths.¹ And they now advanced against Africa, under Genseric, and besieged Hippo. But Augustine was spared the sight of the capture of the town. He died in the midst of the siege, and was taken away from the evil to come.

But it is not for themselves that these features of the outer life of the great Augustine have an interest, so much as for the history which underlies them of his inner life. At Carthage, to which, as we have seen, he was sent at seventeen, Augustine abandoned himself to the licentious habits of that dissolute town. But he was possessed of too powerful an intellect to be satisfied with merely sensual excitement. The Hortensius of Cicero led him to the study of philosophy. And philosophy, again, led him to feel the need of something which should satisfy deeper wants and desires. And the Manichean system

¹ By Alaric, in 410 A.D.

seemed to supply this. It attracted by the profession which it made, that none were required to believe except on full inquiry and satisfaction as to the truth of what it taught. The general principle of the system of Manicheism was the old Oriental one of the existence of two antagonistic principles—the one good, and the other evil. The good was essentially connected with Spirit, while Matter was evil. And hence the work of man consisted in disenthraling the Spirit from the power of Matter. Such was the general principle of Manicheism, which produced a marvellous and complicated system when interwoven with a vast mass of human and Divine truths which were corrupted and perverted by it. Its radical error consisted in this, that it regarded the Spirit as essentially good, and therefore not needing to be purified, and the body as essentially evil, and therefore incapable of purification. Thus it wholly divorced the two, instead of regarding the body as the instrument of the Spirit, to be used for evil or for good, according to the direction for good or evil given to it by the Spirit, its Lord.

It was by this system that the mind of Augustine, as of so many others, was held for a time, to the great grief of Monica, his pious, high-minded, and loving mother. It was as a Manichean that he lived at Carthage on his return there for the second time; and he remained the same at Rome. But at Milan, his delivery came. He heard the words of Ambrose, and was arrested by what he heard. And he was led through the good providence of God gradually on. The light of Christian truth shone into his heart. Conviction took the place of uncertainty. In place of a wavering state of alternate sin and remorse, came the firm resolve to dedicate himself wholly to the service of God. His mother, who had followed him to Milan, lived to witness his baptism, as a Catholic Christian, by the hands of Ambrose: and in all the serene happiness of her accomplished hopes and prayers, expired in his arms before his return to Africa.¹ His son Adeodatus, who died a few years afterwards, was baptized at the same time.² Augustine's remaining history has been already given.

His Position and Times.—The outer features of Augustine's life have an interest on account of the course of the inner life which underlies them. And the course of that inner life has a peculiar interest, because we can trace in it (as the devout student of biography ever loves to do) the preparation by God of a great mind to be the fit instrument for the work to be done at the time in which his lot was cast. The condition of Christianity now was

¹ At Ostia, on their way home. Tittlemont, vol. xiii. 12, in Robertson, vol. i. p. 365.

² Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 276

changed. It had been for three centuries the object of persecution—first to the Jew, and then to the Gentile; first to the populace, and then to the higher Powers in the state. And now at length it had been acknowledged by Constantine. It was now under imperial patronage, with the good and the evil which that brought with it. And one result was, that men had now rest and leisure for debating by themselves and with others questions which had been kept out of sight amid the anxiety and hardship of more troubled times. Was man, in his natural condition, necessarily, or almost necessarily, inclined to evil, as the Manichean would represent? Or was he, on the contrary, quite free and able to do right, with no natural tendency to evil, as Pelagius maintained? If God's grace was needed to aid man in his efforts to do good, how did it act, and where did the part of grace end, and the agency of man begin? And if it was God's grace that enabled man to do right, why was not its power all-sufficient? How could its success (to speak humanly) ever fail? How could it be that some men were brought to repentance and a holy life, while others, as it seemed, were lost for ever? With such questions the mind of S. Augustine was fitted, as far as any human mind can be fitted, to cope. He had held the Manichean system once. He was now a Christian indeed. He had known the deep tendency of man's nature to evil; he knew now the depths of the power of the sanctifying grace of God. And if his mode of meeting the difficulties of the time has its errors, they are the errors which probably must always result from an attempt—however necessary an attempt—to exhibit within the limits of a human system the infinite expanse of the dealings of God, of the spiritual workings of God upon the secret invisible spirit of man.¹

But his teaching has also a more practical use. These were his efforts to soar up to those mountain-heights, which are often covered with mist, while all below is comparatively clear. And it is in their teaching with reference to ordinary practical life, that the value of Augustine's writings especially consists. There are some who know well, in all its secret springs, the working of sin in the heart of man. There are others, again,

¹ 'Augustine' (writes Dean Milman) 'had rejected Manicheism: the antagonistic and equally conflicting powers of that system had offended his high conception of the supremacy of God. Still his earlier Manicheism lent an unconscious colouring to his maturer opinions. In another form, he divided the world into regions of cloudless light and total darkness. Within the pale of election was the world of light; without, the world of perdition; and the human soul was so reduced to a subordinate agent before the mysterious and inscrutable power which, by the infusion of faith, rescued it from its inveterate hereditary propensity, as to become entirely passive, altogether annihilated, in overleaping the profound though narrow gulf which divided the two kingdoms of grace and perdition.'—*'History of Christianity,'* vol. iii. p. 268.

who know well, by deep experience, the blessed effects of the working of God's grace in the soul. But few combine both as Augustine did. He had both fallen deeply into sin, and had also gone far towards perfecting holiness in the fear of God. Accordingly he could, like a skilful physician of the soul, lay open the symptoms of each spiritual disease, and trace it up to its source through the intricate windings of the inner being of man. And he could also exhibit the treatment, and prescribe the medicine supplied by the Almighty Healer for each kind of sin. 'And hence' (as Dean Milman writes) 'his confessions, in which he describes the course of his own spiritual life, have become the manual for all those who are forced by their temperament, or inclined by their disposition, to brood over the inward sensations of their own minds; to trace within themselves all the trepidations, the misgivings, the agonies, the exultation of the religious conscience; the gradual formation of opinions till they harden into dogmas, or warm into objects of ardent passion. Since Augustine, this internal autobiography of the soul has always had the deepest interest for those of strong religious convictions; it was what multitudes had felt, but no one had yet embodied in words; it was the appalling yet attractive manner in which men beheld all the conflicts and adventures of their own spiritual life reflected with bold and speaking truth.

'Men, who shrank from the Divine and unapproachable image of Christian perfection in the life of the Redeemer, turned to the more earthly, more familiar picture of the development of the Christian character, crossed with the light and shade of human weakness and human passion.'¹

His Treatises on the Lord's Prayer.—There are many reflections upon different portions of the Lord's Prayer scattered up and down in Augustine's works; but his chief exposition of it consists of four sermons on it, addressed to the 'Competentes,' who formed the last of the classes into which the Catechumens were divided, consisting of those who were so far advanced as to 'seek' for baptism.²

There are two remarkable passages in these sermons, which illustrate the way in which the Lord's Prayer was learnt and used in the Early Church. Referring to the words of S. Paul, in Romans x. 13, he says—'Because then he said, "How shall

¹ History of Christianity, vol. iii. p. 273.

² Others, however, besides the Competentes, were present, as is clear from the passage in the third Sermon: 'And ye faithful, who, taking advantage of this occasion, are listening to this prayer, and our exposition of it, do ye wholly and from your hearts forgive whatsoever ye have against any.'

‘they call upon Him in whom they have not believed?’”, ye have
 ‘not first learnt the Lord’s Prayer, and after that the Creed;
 ‘but first the Creed, where ye might know what to believe, and
 ‘after that the Prayer, where ye might know Whom to call upon.
 ‘The Creed, then, has respect to faith, the Lord’s Prayer to
 ‘prayer: because it is he who believeth that is heard when he
 ‘calleth.’ And again, speaking of the use of the Prayer, he
 says—‘Every day must the Prayer be said by you when you
 ‘are baptized. For the Lord’s Prayer is said daily in the Church
 ‘before the altar of God, and the faithful hear it. We have no
 ‘fear, therefore, as to your not learning it carefully, because,
 ‘even if any of you should be unable to get it perfectly, he will
 ‘learn it by hearing it day by day.’

As each of the four sermons treats of the whole Prayer, they are necessarily more in the form of a commentary, for the most part, than a complete treatise. Each sermon contains, indeed, many valuable thoughts on the several petitions. But the commentary, being thus more or less fragmentary, is less suited for general reading than the more detailed and connected expositions of Cyprian and Chrysostom. Many of the more striking pieces have been introduced as illustrative passages in the notes to Mr. Karlake’s Exposition of the Prayer. But there is much more left. And all, therefore, who would thoroughly enter into the excellent thoughts of Augustine on the Prayer, will do well to read the sermons through. They are given entire in the ‘Library of the Fathers,’ in the first volume of Augustine’s Homilies on the New Testament.

History of Chrysostom.—Nearly contemporary with S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom was unlike him in all respects—in his early history, his character, his position, and his end. Born at Antioch, about the year 347, seven years before S. Augustine, he was brought up by the loving nurture of his pious mother, Anthusa, to a holy Christian life. Libanius, the great teacher of rhetoric at the time, numbered him among his pupils, and trusted to have in him a powerful maintainer of that philosophy and literature which he loved himself. But John was to obtain the name of Chrysostom, or ‘the golden mouthed,’ as the eloquent exponent of truths higher than Grecian sages had ever attained to. Meletius, bishop of Antioch, marked the powers of the youth, instructed him more deeply in Christian truth, and appointed him a Reader in the Church. For a moment it seemed as if that Church was to lose the active service of this soldier of the Cross; as if his gifts of eloquence were but to be as flowers

‘Born to blush unseen,
 And waste their sweetness on the desert air.’

The retirement from the turmoil and sin of the heathen world, and the opportunities for undivided communion with God, which the hermit life held out, attracted many of the more earnest spirits of that time; and for Chrysostom, too, it had a charm. He would go into some monastery in the Syrian desert, and there consecrate himself to God. For a while, indeed, he was restrained from carrying out his purpose by the urgent entreaties of his mother, whom the loss of her husband had made dependent on the companionship and solace of her son. 'Wait, at least,' are her touching words, 'wait, at least, for my death: perhaps I shall depart before long. When you have laid me in the earth, and reunited my bones to those of your father, then travel wherever thou wilt, even beyond the sea; but, as long as I live, endure to dwell in my house, and offend not God by afflicting your mother, who is, at least, blameless towards thee.' He refrained for a time, in compliance with his mother's request. But eventually, perhaps after her death, he carried out his plan, and withdrew into one of the monasteries in the neighbourhood of Antioch. But he was not to be thus lost to the service of the Church. Again he returned before long to the duties of active life; and events soon occurred at Antioch by which all his eloquence and earnest piety were called forth.

In one of those sudden tumultuous insurrections (to use the words of Dean Milman)¹ which take place among the populace of large cities, Antioch had resisted the exorbitant demands of a new taxation, maltreated the Imperial officers, and thrown down and dragged about, with every kind of insult, the statues of Theodosius, his Empress, and his two sons. And then there followed the stupor of fear as to the consequences of this outbreak of popular rage. The aged Bishop Flavianus, who had now succeeded Meletius, went forth to appease, if it should be possible, the Emperor's wrath. And on Chrysostom, who was now a Presbyter, fell the task of consoling, and encouraging, and exhorting the people during the season of terrible suspense. And all the comfort which Divine truth, set forth with all the eloquence of oratory and the force of an earnest spirit, could supply, was afforded by Chrysostom to the crowds who flocked to listen to his words. And at length the happy answer came. The arguments of Flavianus to the Emperor had prevailed. Theodosius had consented to declare himself a Christian—an imitator of Christ—indeed. The Saviour had forgiven those who crucified Him. He would learn the lesson of the Cross. He, too, would forgive.

¹ Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 211.

His Position and Times.—We have thus far regarded Chrysostom as filling a post for which his powers exactly suited him; as consoling, animating, directing an afflicted Church. Here sorrow had done its work, and the exhortations and reproofs of Chrysostom fell on a soil prepared to receive the seed. But he was now to be transferred to a more arduous post. Eutropius, who governed the Emperor at this time, had heard Chrysostom at Antioch, and resolved to have him as the bishop of the Imperial Church. Some stratagem, it is said, was necessary in order to withdraw Chrysostom from Antioch, where the people were deeply attached to him, and would not willingly have suffered him to go. In this way he was made Bishop of Constantinople, the city which was now the head of the eastern portion of the Roman empire, as Rome was the head of the western part.

It seems hard to say that Chrysostom was a man unfitted for such a place. Rather we ought to say that the place was one unsuited to the high unbending virtues of the man. In Constantinople the presence of the Emperor and his court cast into comparative shade the dignity of the chief ministers of the Church; and Chrysostom's views of the importance of the Christian priesthood would not allow of their being considered to hold a second place. The people had become accustomed to expect—at the same time, perhaps, that they censured—a certain splendour and extravagance in the mode of living of the Bishop; and Chrysostom inclined rather to a retired, and simple, and almost ascetic life. There were many, also, who still held the views of Arius in some form or other, not accepting the absolute divinity of the Son of God; and Chrysostom was the uncompromising maintainer of the orthodox faith. Hence opposition arose against him on all sides. 'All orders and interests' (writes Dean Milman) 'conspired against him. The court would not endure 'the grave and severe censor; the clergy rebelled against the 'rigour of the prelate's discipline; the populace, though, when 'under the spell of his eloquence, fondly attached to his person, 'no doubt in general resented his implacable condemnation of 'their amusements. The Arians, to whom, in his uncompromising zeal, he had persuaded the Emperor to refuse a single 'church, though demanded by the most powerful subject of the 'empire, Gainas the Goth, were still, no doubt, sufficiently 'powerful.'¹

Thus the embers were smouldering, and a slight breath sufficed to fan them into a flame. 'Of all his adversaries the most dangerous, the most persevering, and the most implacable were those of his own order and his own rank.'² Theophilus, the

¹ History of Christianity, vol. iii. p. 226.

² Ibid.

bishop of Alexandria, led the attack. He was indignant with Chrysostom, professedly because he had received and treated kindly some monks of Nitria, who had taken refuge in Constantinople from the persecution of Theophilus, their regular bishop; really, probably, the jealousy which existed between the two great rival sees of the East led him to take so prominent a part in the opposition to Chrysostom. A council, over which he presided, was held at a place called the Oak, in the neighbourhood of Constantinople. Chrysostom refused to recognise its authority and appear before it. He was accordingly condemned; and, yielding to the wishes of his friends, he withdrew to the opposite side of the Bosphorus. But an earthquake which occurred on the night of the following day spread consternation among his enemies; and the Empress Eudoxia, who was one of them, desired his instant return. He returned; boats swarmed on the waters of the Bosphorus to accompany him back, and the multitude of the city met him with every demonstration of respect and joy. But his prosperity was short-lived. The same causes were at work as before, and they issued in the same result. One address is said to have given especial offence. Speaking (it was thought) of the Empress Eudoxia under the name of Herodias, he exclaimed, 'Herodias is dancing: Herodias demands the head of John.' The wrath of the Emperor broke forth. His soldiers entered the great church of S. Sophia on Good Friday, and treated the sacred things with contempt. Chrysostom at length surrendered himself to them. He was immediately conveyed away by night, and was taken to Cucusus, a small town in the wild mountain district of Armenia. But even this was not thought to be severity enough. From this place of exile he could still exercise great influence over the Eastern Church. He was, therefore, to be removed to Pityus, on the Euxine, a still more distant and savage spot. He died near Comana, in Pontus, while on his way.

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer is an excellent one: the most valuable for general readers, we are inclined to think, of all the treatises written in early times. Brief, and at the same time very easy to be understood, and full of practical deductions from the Prayer, it is admirably suited to the needs of mankind at large. And if the treatise of Cyprian supplies the devotional element more, raising up the spirit and leading it to offer up the petitions one by one with a more devout and adoring tone of mind, the treatise of Chrysostom supplies the practical element, and shows what should be the conduct in daily life of those who would worthily offer the Prayer. It, too, is given in the 'Library of the Fathers,' and forms part of the first volume of the Homilies of Chrysostom on the Gospel

of S. Matthew. It is given also, with some slight abbreviation, in the appendix of passages for daily reading at the end of Mr. Karslake's book.

Gregory of Nyssa.—His History and Character.—Far less known to fame than the other two great men who have just been noticed, was Gregory of Nyssa, another writer on the Lord's Prayer. He was born somewhat earlier than either Chrysostom or Augustine, and should, in the strict order of time, have been placed before them. His parents lived in Cappadocia; and at Cæsarea, a town of that district of Asia Minor, he was born about the year 321. After having had, no doubt, a good education, like his brother Basil, he was appointed a reader in the Church. But his great inclination for the profession of rhetorician had nearly withdrawn him from the ministry of the Church, when the touching and beautiful letters of Gregory Nazianzen, the devoted friend of his brother Basil, recalled him to his higher post. When Basil became Archbishop of Cæsarea, he called his brother Gregory to assist him in the duties of his see. But on the bishopric of Nyssa, a small city of Cappadocia, near Lesser Armenia, becoming vacant in the following year, Basil gave up the pleasure and benefit of his brother's society, and consecrated him to it, choosing rather to give him a post in which he might be more extensively useful, than to retain him near himself. This was in the year 372.

His Position and Times.—Two great speculative difficulties seem to have been felt, more or less, all along in the Christian Church. One, 'How can the Divine and Human Nature be combined in the one Person of the Son of God?' The other, 'How is the absolute Deity of Christ compatible with the Unity of the Godhead?' The errors of Arius and others, which had arisen from an attempt to solve this last difficulty, or rather to remove it, by denying to Christ the very same Deity which belonged to the Father, had been opposed in the great council held at Nice in 321. It had been maintained there that Christ was verily *of one nature with the Father*; that He was indeed included in the same essential Deity with the Father, and yet was in Person different from Him. But the Arian opinions still continued to exist. Sometimes assuming one form, and sometimes another; now triumphant in one quarter, now defeated in another, they succeeded, during the whole of the fourth century, in agitating the Church. And as Athanasius stands out as the leader of those who maintained the orthodox doctrine at the council of Nice, and for many years after it, so Gregory of Nyssa was one of the group of chief men who carried on the opposition to the erroneous views after Athanasius was dead. He was

banished, in consequence, by the Emperor Valens for a time, but was recalled by Gratian upon the death of Valens, and restored to his see in the year 378. Three years later, A.D. 381, a great council was held at Constantinople, and Gregory of Nyssa was one of the leading members of it. The denial of the Absolute Deity of the Son had been extended by Macedonius to the Holy Spirit, and the council accordingly added the clauses relating to the Holy Spirit to the Nicene Creed. Thus it was brought at this time into its present form, with the exception of its expressing the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, and not from the Son, the words 'and the Son,' not having been added till the Council of Toledo in 589. In this council, Gregory is represented as taking an active part. He took up with him to it his work written to oppose the errors of the Arian Eunomius, and read it in the presence of Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome. Basil was no longer living to enjoy the satisfaction of listening to his brother's work. Once more Gregory appears as taking part in the later Council of Constantinople in 394. In the last year of the century he passed away, having reached his sixty-ninth year.

One remarkable episode in the life of Gregory of Nyssa deserves to be touched on, as illustrating the condition of the times in which he lived.

When the urgent appeal of Gregory Nazianzen had induced him to return and devote himself to the ministry of the Church, one of his first acts was to go and pay a visit to his sister Macrina. 'That affectionate and zealous sister' (writes the author of the 'Life of Gregory' in the biographical series of Dr. Hook), 'after devoting the bloom of her youth to the care of her brothers, employed her advancing years in guiding a small company of holy women in the paths of a heavenly life, on the banks of the Irus, amid the seclusion of the forests of Pontus, already consecrated to devotion by the labours of her brother Basil.' Such is the glimpse we obtain of the manner in which the Church of Christ was nurtured in secret in those early times. The life of his brother Basil, indeed, supplies a more complete picture of the life passed by those who thus withdrew into retirement for the cultivation of the Christian character, apart from the cares and temptations of the world. But in this slight sketch of his sister's life, we have a glimpse of one, on whom the difficulties of such a life would press more heavily, retiring from the charm and excitement of the world, and consecrating herself to the work of training up herself and others in the paths of a holy Christian life. Such was one form of the labour, for God's service, to which Christian piety

devoted itself in the times of danger and temptation of the early Church.

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—The treatise of Gregory of Nyssa on the Lord's Prayer is more full and complete than that of any of the other early writers upon the Prayer. But this very fulness, while it makes the treatise a most valuable one for study, makes it also difficult to give any adequate idea of it. For it is of far too great a length to be reproduced, more or less entire, in the way in which the treatises of Cyprian and Chrysostom are given in the appendix of Mr. Karlake's book. And though many most striking passages might be extracted from it, such as that on the Duties involved in calling God 'Father,' which is given in a note on the first Lecture, yet these passages, to be fully appreciated, should be read in the 'Orations' of which they form a part. The orations have not yet been translated into English, so far we are aware. But in the original Greek they will be found in the beautifully printed edition of the works of the Fathers, by Migne.

Recapitulation.—With Gregory of Nyssa the sketch of the early literature of the Lord's Prayer naturally concludes. The next great writer on the Prayer was S. Bernard; but in his time the aspect of things was greatly changed. We have passed, when we come to him, out of that complex social, and ecclesiastical, and religious state which makes up our mental picture of the condition of the Early Church. The six writers who have thus far passed under review, have a certain unity. But at the same time, they have much of diversity too. Amid much that was common to them all, there has been much of variety in their characters and times. We have seen the Church at rest in the time of Tertullian, at the close of the second century. The times of Origen and Cyprian have exhibited the persecutions which it endured from the Roman power in the third century, with the differences respecting matters of discipline which those persecutions called forth within the pale of the Church itself. Then, passing on to the fourth century, we have had the condition of the clergy in the capital of the East; the rivalry which occasionally existed between the bishops of the most important sees; and the interference of the Emperor in the affairs of the Church, illustrated by the life of Chrysostom. The speculative differences by which the Church was divided, were brought out by the times of Gregory of Nyssa. And lastly, the Church is seen, in the later days of Augustine, sharing with the empire in the afflictions caused by the incursions of the Gothic tribes.

And very different, too, have been the personal histories, and characters, and attainments of the men themselves. How great

is the difference between the stern and lofty Tertullian, the wise and gentle Cyprian, the enthusiastic Origen, the long-wavering, but at last devoted Augustine, the eloquent Chrysostom, the refined and copious Gregory of Nyssa! Truly God employs builders of various character to rear the superstructure of Christian truth, even as He gave to various master-builders the Divine wisdom whereby the foundations were to be laid. Each of the six writers contribute much that is valuable in explanation of the Lord's Prayer. But their writings are suited for different readers. The obscurity of the style of Tertullian, the inequality of Origen, the fragmentary character of the treatises of Augustine on the Lord's Prayer, and reversely, the copiousness of the writing of Gregory of Nyssa, make their expositions less suited for the general reader than for the student and theologian. By these latter, they should be studied and digested carefully; and there are many passages which may most profitably be selected for illustration from each. But the treatises of Cyprian and Chrysostom may be read throughout with profit by every devout and thoughtful mind. They are given, with some slight abbreviation, in the appendix at the end of Mr. Karalake's book.

ART. IV.—1. *Replies to 'Essays and Reviews.'* By the (I.) REV. E. M. GOULBOURNE, D.D. (II.) REV. H. J. ROSE, B.D. (III.) REV. C. A. HEURTLEY, D.D. (IV.) REV. W. J. IRONS, D.D. (V.) REV. G. RORISON, M.A. (VI.) REV. A. W. HADDAN, B.D. (VII.) REV. CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D. *With a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD; and Letters from the Radcliffe Observer and the Reader in Geology in the University of Oxford.* Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker. 1862.

2. *Aids to Faith; a Series of Theological Essays.* By SEVERAL WRITERS. Edited by WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: John Murray. 1861.

It is no disparagement to the two principal volumes that have appeared in reply to the 'Essays and Reviews,' nor does it imply any disrespect towards the eminent persons who have furnished their respective contributions to them, to say that we do not anticipate any great or immediate results from them. The excitement caused at the time when the notice in the *Quarterly* first brought the 'Essays' into prominence has long since subsided. It has long since been acknowledged that the statements contained in them were neither new, nor their arguments profound; and friends and foes alike have before now been obliged to admit that they have proved a failure. They have failed in carrying the mind of the English people with them. In spite of the immense advantage they have enjoyed from the celebrity of some of their authors, from the unexpectedness of the quarter from which such an attack upon Christianity has come; from the very extraordinary favour with which liberal measures and latitudinarian sentiments are at the present moment received, and, we may add, the reality of many of the difficulties, suggested probably for the first time to many readers on the perusal of this volume—the 'free handling' has not obtained any considerable amount of popularity. It must not, of course, hastily be inferred that there was no necessity for such notices and replies as have from time to time issued from the press. It was very natural that such unscrupulous statements as were made, and such monstrous claims as were implied in their authors' wishing to retain the position and emoluments in the English Church which most of them held, should have raised a storm of indignation, and it was further to be expected

that such feelings would find vent in a sort of guerilla warfare—one writer taking up for investigation such points as seemed most offensive, another devoting his attention to the showing up the fallacies which his own particular line of reading enabled him most easily to expose—whilst some would find a relief to their feelings, in protesting against the falsehoods, or gain-saying the flimsy reasonings which abound throughout the volume. The number of these productions has no doubt been much increased by the extraordinary unanimity of public disapprobation which the authors of *'Essays and Reviews'* have incurred. There are many who would have been on the other side if there had been the faintest appearance of any large or influential section of society adopting the views and conclusions of these gentlemen. We do not think the adherence of any such ephemeral friends at all a matter of congratulation. Truth can afford to dispense with any such defenders, nor need the fact be otherwise alluded to here, than in the light of exhibiting the imbecility of the writers in question, and their entire ignorance of the real state of feeling in English society. We do not give them credit for wanting to make martyrs of themselves for the sake of spreading sceptical opinions through the country, and so we are bound to suppose they expected a more favourable verdict than they have obtained. It is an undeniable fact, that with the exception of the countenance afforded them by personal friends, they have met with no approbation except from infidel or semi-infidel publications. Had this state of things been anticipated, it is possible the two volumes whose titles are placed at the head of this article would never have been projected. As it is, the controversy is well-nigh dead, and before what we are now writing appears in print, the volumes entitled *'Aids to Faith,'* and *'Replies to Essays and Reviews'* will appear amongst Mr. Mudie's list of half-price books, and copies of them will for the most part have ceased to circulate. The particular controversy excited by the volume in question will have been set at rest; the general issue between the Church and Unbelief, the arguments of which latter side appeared condensed and popularized in the *'Essays and Reviews,'* will remain pretty much where it was before. And now the opinion which we ventured to give at the commencement of this paper will be intelligible. As definite answers to the different Essays, these two volumes will have little weight. Whatever there is of value in them will tell both immediately upon intelligent and thoughtful persons, and indirectly in guiding others, and suggesting sources of information on questions which the *'Essays and Reviews'* have for the first time brought before the notice of a large number of miscellaneous readers. As our

readers then will have anticipated, we much prefer the form into which the volume entitled 'Aids to Faith' has been cast, to the direct attack which is made in the seven answers to the seven Essays. Many reasons for our preference will at once occur; but they for the most part resolve themselves into the idea of the disadvantage of position occupied by one who defends an intellectual post which has been attacked. People will, however unreasonably, expect to find a solution of all the doubts and difficulties suggested to their minds by the essayists, and the writer who professes to make a reply, almost engages by the very terms he uses to establish the contradictory of his opponent's thesis. Now if the Essays had been written in concert as a joint and systematic attack on the doctrines of Revelation, and the evidence by which they are established, it might have been possible or easy for seven writers to combine for the purpose of exposing the fallacies of the Essays or the weakness of their authors. But the case is widely different, when, as in this instance, the writers embrace very wide differences of opinions, from a firm belief in some of the fundamental doctrines of the Church down to an absolute disbelief in the personality of God. Some passages of the Essays contain truths which are recognized by every body, some again, matters of doubtful credit; others speak definitely, others very vaguely, so as to leave it quite uncertain what the author means or believes. Again, objections may be raised against the facts alleged or the arguments adduced in their support; in the abstract an exception may be taken on the ground of the inconsistency of attempting to reconcile a belief in the Bible, or again a profession of Churchmanship, with disbelief of plain implications in the former or still plainer statements in the latter. Again, it may happen that a whole Essay may contain nothing very palpably erroneous or mischievous; the answer to it may be very good, and very much to the point; yet may perhaps convey an impression of carping unnecessarily at allowable differences of opinion. On this ground a direct reply to Dr. Temple's Essay seems to us a mistake. It does not contain as a whole, anything more than an absurd and fanciful and palpably erroneous theory; but such theory does not impugn the faith once delivered to the saints. It strikes us that the best thing that can be said of Dr. Temple's Essay is, that it is the production of an immature mind, scarcely reaching above a schoolboy's essay; and the worst, that it appears in such very bad company. And so we should have been content to leave it alone, being quite convinced that had it appeared as a separate publication, it would have attracted no attention whatever, that it would have fallen dead from the press, and probably have taught its author by its failure not to

venture into print again till he had something more worth the hearing to tell us, or something less heavy to amuse his readers with.

There is one other very important advantage possessed by the volume issued under the superintendence of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. As its name imports, it offers assistance to those whose faith stands in need of confirmation; and though it does not often openly challenge the positions of the essayists, yet it has in view the state of vacillation as regards matters of faith which the Essays have either found or created. It is scarcely controversial enough to run the risk of being found fault with by friendly parties, whilst the other volume must be content to be criticised on the ground of any portion of it being found inadequate to the task undertaken. The *'Replies to Essays and Reviews'* occupy a volume which looks like a smart bookseller's publication; the *'Aids to Faith,'* on the contrary, have somewhat of the unity that might be expected to pervade a work which is the product of a single mind. There is scarcely one of the *'Replies'* that is all we could wish, whilst the *'Aids to Faith,'* perhaps, with the exception of the Bishop of Cork's Essay, all supply some information, or, at least, some material for thought.

To Dr. Wordsworth's Essay we shall make no further allusion than to say that it exposes a few of the more palpable of the blunders made by Mr. Jowett, but leaves the main question of the interpretation and inspiration of Holy Scripture very much where Mr. Jowett leaves it; the differences of opinion respecting the former still require the same effort of thought to be appreciated; and the subject of inspiration is not at all clearer to our minds after the perusal of Dr. Wordsworth's Essay than it was before we began it. We did not at all expect that it would be. We shall recur to the subject presently when we notice Dean Ellicott's *'Strictures on Scripture and its Interpretation.'* We are not disappointed that neither of these writers has elaborated any definite theory of inspiration, because we think that no such theory is possible; but we regret that a writer who is evidently entirely satisfied with his own view of the case, and has probably a definite theory of Inspiration, has not contributed more to the solution of doubts and difficulties suggested by his opponents.

Of the remaining six Replies in this volume we forbear to notice Dr. Goulburn's and Mr. Haddan's, except to acknowledge the singular ability and fulness of the latter paper, on the ground that the Essays by Dr. Temple and Mr. Pattison do not seem to us to require a systematic answer. We have before now, in this Review, commented upon both of these; and we repeat,

that little as we like or approve of the tone of either of them, and much as we doubted many implications in both, we do not think any direct reply to either was called for. Dr. Temple's paper contained a worthless comparison, worked threadbare, and Mr. Pattison's some valuable remarks on the controversial tone of the theology of the eighteenth century in England. The papers we have read with the greatest satisfaction, are those by Mr. Rose and Dr. Irons; and perhaps a short account of these may be interesting to such of our readers as have not been able to procure the volume for themselves, or have not time enough to spend upon the controversy between the Church and Infidelity. Mr. Rose undertakes to do battle with the critical school as represented by Chevalier Bunsen and Dr. Williams, his English expositor.

We will not enter upon the question how far Dr. Williams has made himself responsible for the views of Baron Bunsen, some of which he advocates, some of which he appears to dissent from, and of some of which he gives us no means of ascertaining what his opinion may be. The writer of the Reply considers that the argument is addressed *ad populum* rather than *ad Clerum*, and fairly observes that:—

'If any man addresses to those who have neither the leisure, nor always the acquirements, necessary to the prosecution of such inquiries, the most peremptory decisions on questions which have exercised the greatest philologists, and accompanies them with gross insinuations against those who differ from him; if he represents the state of opinion in Germany, and the course of prophetic exegesis in general, with the utmost unfairness, and attempts by such representations to bias the opinions of his readers, we may fear that he is likely to cause many, who are but slightly acquainted with these subjects, to make shipwreck of their faith. This is the *only* ground of fear. We have no fear that the truth of Scripture, which has borne for more than a thousand years the battle and the strife of man, will succumb under a puny attack like this. It has survived the assaults of Celsus and Porphyry, of Bayle and Voltaire, of Gibbon and Hume, and it is not very likely that it will fall by the hands of Bunsen and Dr. Williams. It is the unfair representations, the partial and the one-sided views of this Essay, announced *ex cathedra*, and coupled with contemptuous insinuations against those who hold the ancient opinions, which render it worth while to spend a moment in answering it. They may deceive the unlearned and the superficial, but there is really nothing in the Essay itself which adds a new argument to the old conditions of the great problem, or would give the smallest uneasiness to those who really know the history of Scripture criticism in Germany and England. These accusations may appear to be expressed in strong language, but if they can be substantiated they will shew that, however learned Dr. Williams may be, however capable of writing a trustworthy treatise on Scripture, the Essay he has ventured to publish in this volume is worthless as a guide to truth, and altogether unworthy of his reputation and his position. It is a very legitimate subject of inquiry to ascertain generally, whether the representations of this Essay, or Review, are trustworthy or not, and to that inquiry I now propose to devote my attention.'

—*Replies*, pp. 62, 63.

Accordingly, Mr. Rose proceeds to expose the misrepresentations of Dr. Williams under three heads. 1. The misstatement with regard to the acceptance of the German critical school of the alleged disproof of the genuineness of large portions of the Bible. 2. The misrepresentation of English writers upon prophecy, as gradually giving up the interpretation of prophecy as referring to a Messiah. 3. The misrepresentation of certain passages in Scripture. As regards the first of these three points, Mr. Rose meets the insinuations of Dr. Williams by simply stating the fact as it stands, and giving the names of well-known German authors who, so far from fearing any ridicule on the score of upholding orthodoxy, have successfully attacked the Rationalist school, a school which, as he observes, is never to be trusted for its facts when a theory is at stake. What is most, however, to the point is, the discrepancies in the opinions of these writers. From all that Dr. Williams has said, an unwary reader would be in great danger of supposing that, whether right or wrong, the German critics were at least unanimous in their opinion. Mr. Rose observes that it would be difficult to find any position maintained by one which is not destroyed by the rest. If any one wants to see this statement verified in a particular instance, we may refer him to the triumphant refutation of Rationalistic theory prefixed to Dr. Pusey's '*Commentary on the Prophet Jonah*.' One instance given by Mr. Rose will serve as a specimen of what is meant. The Song of Solomon, according to Gesenius, the highest philological authority of the critical school, must have been written at a time when the Hebrew language had been altered by an admixture of Chaldaic forms and phrases. On the other hand, Ernest Renan, a high authority on the Semitic dialects, assures us, that the same book must be at least as early as the tenth century before the Christian era. In fact, it would be easy to prove, if we followed German writers in their denial that certain books could have been written in certain centuries, that they never were written at all. Moreover, it is worth observing, that even Rationalist writers are beginning in some cases to decide in favour of the old established view, as, for instance, in Dr. Tholuck's '*Introduction to the Old Testament*.' With regard to English writers, Dr. Williams is equally ignorant, or equally unscrupulous in his assertions. The reader may adopt whichever hypothesis seems to him to suit the case best. First, he accuses Bishop Chandler, who 'is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic.' Against this assertion Mr. Rose quotes from Chandler's answer to Collins, the following:—

'But not to rest in generals, let the disquisition of particular texts determine the truth of this author's assertion. *To name them all* would carry me into too great length. *I shall therefore select some of the principal prophecies*, which being proved to regard the Messiah immediately and solely, in the obvious and literal sense according to scholastick rules, *may serve as a specimen* of what the Scriptures have predicted of a Messiah that was to come.'—*Ibid.* p. 81.

The same sentence in which Bishop Chandler is attacked contains also an absurd misrepresentation of Bishop Butler and Paley, the latter of whom is accused of quoting only one prophecy, because he mentions one which is the clearest and strongest of all, and the former is supposed to have shrunk from the Messianic interpretation of prophecy, partly because 'literature was not his strong point,' and partly because he foresaw that the prophecies might all have their elucidation in contemporaneous history.

Both these points, as well as the third, are fully and patiently investigated by Mr. Rose, who by no means overstates the case when he recapitulates the results obtained. They are as follows:—

'1. That the author in his account of the present state of theological literature in Germany has entirely misrepresented its condition; that he has greatly exaggerated the achievements of the critical school, and appears utterly to ignore its miserable failures, blunders, and extravagances; and that either from his ignorance of the fact, or from a wilful suppression of the truth, he gives the impression that there is an almost unanimous acceptance of these views among the learned in Germany, while the real truth is that the rationalist cause is daily losing ground in that country.

'2. That in describing the course of prophetic interpretation in England, the author has entirely misrepresented the whole case. That he has specified three persons in particular as giving indirect testimony to his views, viz., Bishop Chandler, Bishop Butler, and Dr. Paley, and that in every case he has utterly misrepresented their testimony. Of Bishop Chandler's views he appears wholly ignorant; Bishop Butler's argument he has entirely misunderstood; and with regard to Dr. Paley, he has misrepresented his selection of one case only as a virtual abandonment of the rest, while the author himself expressly obviates in the strongest possible terms any such inference from this selection.

'3. That in the exegesis of particular passages the author has shown by the arrogance with which he treats those who differ from him, even in the most difficult passages, that he is either wholly ignorant of the weight of argument and authority against him, or unable to appreciate it; and that in order to favour his views he has in one case misrepresented the views of Jerome, and garbled his text so as to favour his misrepresentation; that he has attributed to Jerome exegetical absurdities on a very partial examination of his words, to which a further acquaintance with Jerome would give a very different colouring; and that no person desiring to know the truth on any of these questions would derive any assistance from the remarks of the Essayist, but, on the contrary, would necessarily derive a very false impression from them.

'4. That in regard to the interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii., the Essayist has given the highest praise to Bunsen for an interpretation which has very little to recommend it, and what he has exhibited in some particulars is flatly contradicted by the very passages adduced to prove it; that notwithstanding his

high praise of this interpretation, he rejects it. himself, and yet most strangely endeavours to amalgamate it with two, if not three, other interpretations with which it is wholly incompatible; and that he has thus given to the world a specimen of utter incompetence in the interpretation of Scripture, which must take away all confidence in his opinions, until he shows that he has better grounds for them than any which he has hitherto put forth.

‘ 5. That in regard to Daniel, the Essayist has done nothing except to assert a few of the oldest and the most commonplace objections to the genuineness of this part of Scripture; that he takes no notice of the fact that they have frequently been refuted, but brings them forward as if they were irresistible, only because he yields assent to them himself.’—*Ibid.* pp. 119—121.

We pass on to Dr. Irons’ reply to Mr. Wilson on the idea of the National Church. This Essay commences with a masterly analysis of the changes which the theory of Natural Religion in England has undergone; and traces with great ability the rise of the Secularism or New Nationalism proposed by the writer of the Essay. Dr. Irons then proceeds to give an account of the theory itself which he professes to combat. Our readers who are not acquainted with the volume of *Essays and Reviews* may be referred to the account of Mr. Wilson’s Essay given in the first notice of the work which appeared in this Review. Dr. Irons truly observes, ‘that if that theory were accepted by us, and further acted out, it must involve the rejection of the entire ‘Christianity of the Bible or the Church, ancient or modern.’ The generalized Christianity which we are invited to adopt began by giving up parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, as being now recognized as of at least doubtful credibility. The next step involves the sacrifice of such words of our Saviour and His disciples as have endorsed these statements of the Old Testament. From giving up the words, the next step is easy to disbelieving the facts of the Gospel narrative, till the miserable residuum of belief is reduced to this, that there was such a person as Jesus, who lived eighteen centuries ago, whose history was written some thirty years after the events took place.

Mr. Wilson’s idea really seems to be, that as to doctrine, the Apostles did not trouble themselves much about it, and for morals they were obliged to put up with a state of things far short of any ideal standard that might be thought of. We think we scarcely misrepresent him in saying, that he seems to regard individual immorality as a thing of little or no consequence, supposing the tone of the society in general be respectable. It seems monstrous that this idea of ‘Multitudinism,’ as it is absurdly enough called, should claim the support of the early Church.

Yet such is the claim set up by the author of this Essay, and to the examination of this claim Dr. Irons next addresses

himself. For those who wish to be furnished with the weapons fit to conduct the argument for themselves against the essayist and those who think or pretend to think with him, there is here supplied a complete armoury; but we will not insult our readers by drawing out at length what it was quite necessary for the author to do, the long line of well-known passages of the Gospels and Epistles, which entirely overthrow any theory like that of Mr. Wilson's, that the Church was constructed on a comprehensive scheme, aiming at the interests of this world rather than the concerns of the invisible world, intended rather to influence large masses of men in the way of civilisation, than to deal with the case of individual souls.

We feel that we owe a sort of apology to both these able writers for going so cursorily over their valuable essays, but we have no space, when so many have to be noticed, for giving a complete account even of those whose contributions appear to us to be most striking. There is one point in Dr. Irons' Essay which has pleased us much. He is the only one of the writers in these two volumes who appears to know that the contest is between the Church and the Infidel, rather than between the Bible and its opponents. Other writers may insist, and with good reason too, on the folly of the attack levelled against many different portions of the Bible. Each onslaught may have been vigorously repulsed—yet it is keenly felt that many individuals have been wounded or destroyed. This author alone appears to have grasp of mind to see that the only safety is the citadel of the Church; the principle of Protestantism has not much to fall back upon when it is rudely assailed as to the genuineness, the truth, or the interpretation of that Bible upon which it is content to stake its existence. It is an ominous defeat for Protestants to be obliged to surrender one of those texts behind which it entrenches itself as presenting an impregnable front for defence. It does not look promising when the most conclusive isolated text in the whole of the New Testament for the proof of the doctrine of the blessed Trinity in Unity has to be surrendered. But the Catholic Churchman can calmly investigate the evidence, and gladly acquiesce in the force of truth prevailing, because to him this sacred doctrine does not depend for its support upon any number of texts that can be adduced, but upon the concurrent testimony of the Bible, confirming the judgment of the Universal Church.

In opposition to Mr. Wilson's idea of accommodating the doctrines of the Church to the fading belief of half-educated people, and enlarging her comprehensiveness at the expense of her purity, Dr. Irons is hopeful, and even sanguine, as to the

prospects of the National Church. We could have wished to make many extracts from this interesting paper, but we must content ourselves with presenting our readers with its conclusion.

'Let no one imagine so vain a thing as that a practical people will tolerate a generalized "ideal of Christianity" as Divine. As little also will a free people bear any form of compulsory Religion. Yet will "the public" ultimately demand something more spiritual than its own "opinion." It will have an "historical Christianity." A narrow few may have already persuaded themselves to "give up the Church, and fall back on the Bible;" but what will they do with the "critics?"—Certainly they will need a learned clergy; and what then shall become of the fanatics? Will they do as they have done before,—avail themselves of the scholarship which shields them, and then go on awhile, until they need a fresh deliverance?

'But let us hope for better things. A noble spectacle it may be for the world, if this free land, with its illustrious Monarch and free Parliament, should teach observant Europe, that a highly educated Church may be trusted to fulfil her spiritual mission. A statesman really worthy of the name, seeing among our twenty thousand clergy some, and not a few, foremost in science, and all eager for the spread of real knowledge; seeing others (and they too not a few) giving their high gifts and hard lives to difficult enterprise for Christ's cause in the whole habitable globe; seeing, once more, the vast multitude of them engaged in the ten thousand villages of our nation, in life-long work for the Gospel,—such an one might believe that such a Church, freely and generously trusted, might make Christianity Catholic in our land. Our Church's character is marvellously "National" now; it is one with the people, even in its faults no less than its efforts; and it doubts not that its future, in the truest sense, shall be "National." Nor would it be less speedily so, but far more, if the Church were even as free as the judges in their proper sphere,—that sphere being *entirely* Spiritual.

'It will not detract from the National character of the Church, if her inner and spiritual affairs be untouched by the State.—Look at the ten thousands of English homes of which, in uncounted examples, it may be said in the touching words of an apostle, there is a "Church in that house!" Are they not the glory of the "Nation?" Have they no inner life beyond that which statesmen can regulate? Are they not "National?"

'And so, in a far higher measure, and with yet fuller authority and grace, the "Nationality" of our CHURCH OF ENGLAND, if she may do her own work, shall yet abide,—founded on the "hidden life" which CHRIST has given her, and sanctifying the souls of the people, for HIM who "purchased" them for His own.'—*Ibid.* pp. 274, 275.

Before going on to notice the other volume in this controversy, we must be permitted to say a few words on the Bishop of Oxford's Preface. It is, we think, to be regretted, that the Bishop's numerous duties should have prevented his reading the Essays which he recommends and in fact introduces to the world under the sanction of his name. Still the volume would have wanted something we should have missed if the introduction descriptive of the volume of Essays and Reviews had not been there. After noticing the insufficiency of the account of present views, which would characterize them all as

part of a reaction from the recently renewed assertion of the pre-eminent importance of dogmatic truth, and of primitive Christian practice, the Bishop continues as follows :—

'The rejection of the faith, which in the last age assumed the coarse and vulgar features of an open atheism, which soon destroyed itself in its own multiplying difficulties, intellectual, moral, civil, and political, has robed itself now in more decent garments, and exhibits to the world the old deceit with far more comely features. For the rejection of all fixed faith, all definite revelation, and all certain truth, which is intolerable to man as a naked atheism, is endurable, and even seductive, when veiled in the more decent half-concealment of pantheism. The human soul in its greatness and in its weakness crying after God, cannot bear to be told that God is nowhere, but can be cajoled by the artful concealment of the same lie under the assertion that God is everywhere, for that everything is God. The dull horror of annihilation is got rid of by the notion of an absorption into the infinite, which promises to the spirit an unlimited expansion of its powers, with the misty hope of retained individual consciousness. Nor in this system is all former belief to be cast away at the rude assault of an avowed infidelity; on the contrary, it is to be treated with the utmost tenderness. It is not even stated to be false; in a certain sense it, too, is allowed to be true; for there is nothing which is wholly true or wholly false. It is but one phase of the true—an imperfect, childish, almost infantine phase, if you will; to be cherished in remembrance like the ornaments or the delights of childhood, only not to be rested in by men; to be put away and looked back upon, as early forms which, as soon as the Spirit which had of old breathed through them revealed itself in rosy light, dissolved, like the frost-work of the morning beneath the full sunlight of noon. On this theory the facts of the Bible may be false, its morals deceptive, its philosophy narrow, its doctrines mere shadows cast by the acting of the human mind in its day of lesser light: and yet, on the other hand, it is not to be scorned; it is to be loved, and honoured, and revered as a marvellous record of the God-enlightened man in his infancy, in the comparative obscurity of his intellect, in his youthful struggles, and reachings forth after the truth; only it is not to fetter his now ripened humanity. The man is not to be swathed in the comeliest bands of his infancy.

'Thus no prejudice is to be shocked, no holy feeling rudely wounded, no old truth professedly surrendered. Rather, mighty revelations are to be looked for amidst the glowing feelings with which the past is fondly recognised and the future eagerly expected. Thus the pride of man's heart is flattered to the utmost; thus the old whisper, "Ye shall be as gods," disguises itself in newest utterances; thus in the universal twilight all the fixed outlines of revealed truth are confounded; the forms of Christianity are dissolved into nothingness, and the good deposit of the faith evaporated into a temporary intellectual myth, which has played its part, done its work, and may be permitted quietly to disappear amongst the venerable shadows of the past.'—*Ibid.* pp. xi.—xiii.

The volume entitled 'Aids to Faith' is much more systematic than that which we have been noticing. We have said that it does not profess to take the 'Essays and Reviews' *seriatim*, and refute their contents. Rather does it contain suggestions which may be useful to those whose faith is at any point endangered by the existing state of scepticism around them. There is, however, one, the opening Essay of the series, of which it may be said, that the writer has engaged in single combat with

one of the essayists. That Professor Mansel has won so easy a victory over his opponent, is due, more to the weakness of the cause, than to the ability of the combatant, great as that ability has been shown to be, both in previous writings, and especially in the present 'Essay on Miracles as Evidences of Christianity.'

It has been reasonably objected, that apologists for the Christian faith have been content to argue the case upon the separate classes of evidence. People have been willing, for instance, to risk the credit of Christianity on the fact of accomplished prophecy, or on that of attested miracles. It is easy to see how much the cumulative argument for the truth of Christianity loses by this process. It is unwise to argue the case at such a disadvantage. Still more foolish is it to allow of the evidence for each individual miracle to be separately impugned. It might, for instance, be quite possible to take some one miracle recorded in the Gospels or Acts of the Apostles, and exhibit it as being either in itself incredible, or supported by small evidence; and it is easy to see what effect this would have on sceptical minds in invalidating the supposed evidence for other miracles. Dr. Heurtley, in his 'Essay on the Miracles,' has stated the case fairly as regards one of its aspects—viz. that the miracles are not to be treated as if they were facts, isolated from the whole Jewish dispensation, but rather as part of a large scheme, which carried with it an immense amount of evidence of its own. But Mr. Mansel has, over and above this, drawn attention to the fact, that miracles, quite independently of their evidential character, are part and parcel of the Christian Revelation, which cannot afford to part with them as evidence, because it is necessarily bound up with them, and must fall to the ground if they be denied. Independently of the Resurrection of Christ being a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith, it is clear that the miraculous works of Christ and His Apostles profess to be supernatural. It is not as if the works had been done, and left to speak for themselves as to their own nature; they are done by their performers, who profess that they are supernatural, and if it can be proved that they are natural, the whole credit of those who worked them at once vanishes, and with it the Christian Revelation falls to the ground. We are not concerned here to represent this as an *argumentum ad hominem* merely, as if we had no other resource but to represent the inevitable consequence of the objection to miracles, and so to deter people from adopting it. It is otherwise a very important principle. Miracles must be regarded in two distinct lights; first, as evidential; secondly, as part of the Revelation. The position which Professor Baden Powell adopted in his Essay is utterly untenable. He wished to dispense with the evidence

of miracles, but to retain his belief in Christianity. It never occurred to him, that the very fact that Christ and His Apostles wrought these works, and appealed to them as miracles, is entirely destructive of the moral character of the workers, if it can be shown that miracles are impossible. This is the preliminary observation of Mr. Mansel's Essay; the whole of which is most temperately expressed, and we cannot but think has reference, in this respect, rather to the character of the writer, who is now no longer able to defend himself, than to the quality of the Essay. Perhaps it was, upon the whole, wise to abstain from ridiculing the poverty of argument shown by Professor Powell throughout his 'Essay on Miracles,' but we are quite at a loss to account for Mr. Mansel's designation of the writer whom he is criticising, as an acute author, on any other ground than the supposition that the whole of the following passage is a piece of irony:—

"See 'Essays and Reviews,' p. 141. It is astonishing that this acute author should not have seen the absurdity of introducing this statement in connection with testimony. No witness could possibly *see* two and two make five, or four, or any number, *in the abstract*; he must *see* it in connection with certain *visible* objects. Put the case in its only possible form:—let a man say that he had seen two balls, and then two more, put together, and five balls produced from them; and, instead of an impossibility, we have but the commonest of jugglers' tricks."—*Aids to Faith*, p. 12, *note*.

We cannot think that Professor Powell has shown much acuteness in any of his recent publications; and the comparison between a case of testimony to a fact, and the assertion of an abstract truth, seems to us to indicate a mind utterly unable to understand the first principles of philosophy, and the elementary distinction between the truths of sense and the truths of intuition.* However, we have no wish to find fault with Mr. Mansel for dealing leniently with an opponent whose conquest has been so easy. It would, perhaps, have been more curious than profitable to inquire into the character of the mind which was so led away by the love of inductive science, as to state its claims to certainty, in language far beyond what any philosopher has ever before ventured upon. Mr. Mansel's argument is throughout practical, and he has omitted to notice the extravagant and groundless claim for the certainty of inductive generalizations, even within their own sphere. The principal argument of the Essay is intended to represent miracles as occupying an entirely different standing-ground; but before we go on to notice it, we must not omit to remark the entire overthrow of one of Professor Powell's false assertions, which appears at first sight to be true, because there are so many instances to which it will apply with truth. The expression is as follows:—'No testimony can

'reach to the supernatural; testimony can apply only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon; that it is due to supernatural causes is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumption of the parties.'

Mr. Mansel's reply is as follows:—

'Whatever may be the value of this objection as applied to a hypothetical case, in which the objector may select such occurrences and such testimonies as suit his purpose, it is singularly inapplicable to the works actually recorded as having been done by Christ and His Apostles, and to the testimony by which they are actually supported. It may, with certain exceptions, be applicable to a case in which the assertion of a supernatural cause rests solely on the testimony of the *spectator* of the fact; but it is not applicable to those in which the cause is declared by the *performer*. Let us accept, if we please, merely as a narrative of "apparent sensible facts," the history of the cure of the blind and dumb demoniac, or the lame man at the Beautiful Gate; but we cannot place the same restriction upon the words of our Lord and of St. Peter, which expressly assign the supernatural cause: "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you:" "By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth doth this man stand here before you whole." We have here, at least, a testimony reaching to the supernatural; and if that testimony be admitted in these cases, it may be extended to the whole series of wonderful works performed by the same persons. For if a given cause can be assigned as the true explanation of any single occurrence of the series, it becomes at once the most reasonable and probable explanation of the remainder. The antecedent presumption against a narrative of miraculous occurrences, whatever may be its weight, is only applicable to the narrative taken as a whole, and to the entire series of miracles which it contains. But if a single true miracle be admitted as established by sufficient evidence, the entire history to which it belongs is at once removed from the ordinary calculations of more or less probability. One miracle is enough to show that the series of events with which it is connected is one which the Almighty has seen fit to mark by exceptions to the ordinary course of His Providence; and, if this be once granted, we have no *à priori* grounds on which we can determine how many of such exceptions are to be expected. If a single miracle recorded in the Gospels be once admitted, the remainder cease to have any special antecedent improbability, and may be established by the same evidence which is sufficient for ordinary events. For the improbability, whatever it may be, reaches no further than to show that it is unlikely that God should work miracles at all; not that it is unlikely that He should work more than a certain number.'—*Ibid.* pp. 7, 8.

After noticing that the miracles of the Old Testament can only be rightly estimated through their connexion with those of the New, Mr. Mansel proceeds to the real question at issue between the essayist and himself, which is 'the possibility of miracles,' with regard to which he truly observes, that the position of those who disbelieve in their possibility, is exactly the same as when the argument was stated by Hume, as follows:—
'A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature, and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire

'as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined.' As we have examined and exposed the fallacy of the argument from experience before now (see *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1857) we need not enter upon the subject again. We little thought, at that time, that the avowed infidel's argument would have met with the support of any one professing Christianity, much less of a clergyman of the Church of England. But it must be observed, that Professor Powell, though he has added nothing to the unalterable experience of Hume, has gone considerably beyond him in arrogance of assertion.

The progress of science has shown, it is said, beyond all reasonable doubt, that miracles are impossible. And the assertor of this comprehensive proposition claims to believe in the narrative of the New Testament side by side with the full conviction of the impossibility of the miraculous. Hume was at least consistent, for he used the alleged impossibility to enable him to disbelieve the facts recorded in Scripture. Professor Powell ought at least in common consistency to have shown that physical science was advancing in the direction of enabling human beings to cure disease by a word or a touch, to give sight to the blind, to raise the dead, &c. With reference to this, Mr. Mansel very acutely observes:—

'In one respect, indeed, the advance of physical science tends to strengthen rather than to weaken our conviction of the supernatural character of the Christian miracles. In whatever proportion our knowledge of physical causation is limited, and the number of unknown natural agents comparatively large, in the same proportion is the probability that some of these unknown causes, acting in some unknown manner, may have given rise to the alleged marvels. But this probability diminishes when each newly-discovered agent, as its properties become known, is shown to be inadequate to the production of the supposed effects, and as the residue of unknown causes, which might produce them, becomes smaller and smaller. We are told, indeed, that "the inevitable progress of research must, within a longer or shorter period, unravel all that seems most marvellous;" but we may be permitted to doubt the relevancy of this remark to the present case, until it has been shown that the advance of science has in some degree enabled men to perform the miracles performed by Christ. When the inevitable progress of research shall have enabled men of modern times to give sight to the blind with a touch, to still tempests with a word, to raise the dead to life, to die themselves, and to rise again, we may allow that the same causes might possibly have been called into operation, two thousand years earlier, by some great man in advance of his age. But until this is done, the unravelling of the marvellous in other phenomena only serves to leave these mighty works in their solitary grandeur, as wrought by the finger of God, unapproached and unapproachable by all the knowledge and all the power of man.—*Ibid.* pp. 13, 14.

It is a singular fact that the argument against the possibility of miracles entirely ignores the existence of mind in the universe. If it be once granted that an individual mind exists

endowed with free-will, then it is certain that that free-will is perpetually interfering with the phenomena of the material universe. Here we may again be permitted to refer to a previous paper in this Review (see *Christian Remembrancer* for April, 1861). It was there observed that the alteration of climate in a whole island might depend on the caprice of an individual, according as he should or should not decide to cut down the trees and clear away the ground. And it may further be observed that the alteration of any one physical phenomenon undoubtedly has some effect, and may have a much greater effect than we at all suspect, on the facts of the universe, whether past or future:—

'Admit,' says Mr. Mansel, 'the existence of a free will in man; and we have the experience of a power, analogous, however inferior, to that which is supposed to operate in the production of a miracle, and forming the basis of a legitimate argument from the less to the greater. In the Will of man we have the solitary instance of an Efficient Cause in the highest sense of the term, acting among and along with the physical causes of the material world, and producing results which would not have been brought about by any invariable sequence of physical causes left to their own action. We have evidence, also, of an *elasticity*, so to speak, in the constitution of nature, which permits the influence of human power on the phenomena of the world to be exercised or suspended at will, without affecting the stability of the whole. We have thus a precedent for allowing the possibility of a similar interference of a higher will on a grander scale, provided for by a similar elasticity of the matter subjected to its influence. Such interferences, whether produced by human or by super-human will, are not contrary to the laws of matter; but neither are they the result of those laws. They are the work of an agent who is independent of the laws, and who, therefore, neither obeys them nor disobeys them. If a man, of his own free will, throws a stone into the air, the motion of the stone, as soon as it has left his hand, is determined by a combination of purely material laws; partly by the attraction of the earth; partly by the resistance of the air; partly by the magnitude and direction of the force by which it was thrown. But by what *law* came it to be thrown at all? What law brought about the circumstance through which the aforesaid combination of material laws came into operation on this particular occasion and in this particular manner? The law of gravitation, no doubt, remains constant and unbroken, whether the stone is lying on the ground or moving through the air; but neither the law of gravitation, nor all the laws of matter put together, could have brought about this particular result, without the interposition of the free will of the man who throws the stone. Substitute the will of God for the will of man; and the argument, which in the above instance is limited to the narrow sphere within which man's power can be exercised, becomes applicable to the whole extent of creation, and to all the phenomena which it embraces.'—*Ibid.* pp. 19, 20.

The whole of this argument depends upon the assumption of the existence of a Personal God, of whose acts and purposes we may speak in language such as we use when we speak of the acts and purposes of beings endowed with free-will.

The evidence of such existence Mr. Mansel finds rather in the phenomena of mind than in that of matter. We cannot

entirely follow either Mr. Mansel, or Jacobi, from whom he quotes an interesting passage, the point of which is that 'Nature conceals God,' and that 'Man reveals God.' Yet the very strength of the mode of expression seems to point out the more clearly what is intended—that in judging either of the possibility or the probability of miracles, the principal evidence will not be derived from the laws of the material universe, but from the observation of the mind of man, and the relation in which it stands to that Creative Intelligence, of which it is the copy, and whose existence it suggests.

'It is altogether an erroneous view to represent the question between general law and special interposition as if it rested on mechanical considerations only,—as if it could be judged by the difference between constructing a machine which, when once made, can go on continuously by its own power, and one which, at successive periods, requires new adjustments. The miracle is not wrought for the sake of the physical universe, but for the sake of the moral beings within it; and the question to be considered is not whether a divine interposition is needed to regulate the machinery of nature, but whether it is needed or adapted to promote the religious welfare of men. If the spiritual restoration of mankind has in any degree been promoted by means of a religion professing to have been introduced by the aid of miracles, and whose whole truth is involved in the truth of that profession, we have a sufficient reason for the miraculous interposition, superior to any that can be urged for or against it from considerations derived from the material world. The very conception of a *revealed* as distinguished from a *natural* religion implies a manifestation of God different in kind from that which is exhibited by the ordinary course of nature; and the question of the probability of a miraculous interposition is simply that of the probability of a revelation being given at all.'—*Ibid.* p. 29.

We have only space for one more extract from this interesting essay, and, indeed, we have already dwelt longer upon it than we intended. Our excuse must be that it is by far the best essay in the two volumes which we have been criticising.

'The question, then, only requires to be disentangled of its confusion, to be very briefly answered. If it is considered theoretically and in the abstract, with reference merely to the logical character of certain doctrines in themselves, and not to the circumstances and needs of men, we may divide, as is usually done, the doctrines of religion into those which are and those which are not discoverable by human reason; regarding the former as prior to revelation, and furnishing a negative criterion which no true revelation can contradict; while the latter are posterior to revelation, and rest immediately on the authority of a divinely commissioned Teacher, and mediately on the proofs of his divine mission, whatever these may be. And it is at this stage of the inquiry that the question concerning the evidential value of miracles properly comes in. A teacher who proclaims himself to be specially sent by God, and whose teaching is to be received on the authority of that mission, must, from the nature of the case, establish his claim by proofs of another kind than those which merely evince his human wisdom or goodness. A superhuman authority needs to be substantiated by superhuman evidence; and what is superhuman is miraculous. It is not *the truth of the doctrines*, but *the authority of the teacher*, that miracles are employed to prove; and the authority being established, the truth of the

doctrine follows from it. In this manner our Lord appeals to His miracles as evidences of His mission: "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." It is easy to say that we might have known Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, had He manifested Himself merely as a moral teacher, without the witness of miracles. It is easy to *say* this, because it is impossible to *prove* it. We cannot reverse the facts of history: we cannot make the earthly life of Christ other than it was. As a matter of fact, He did unite miraculous powers with pure and holy doctrine; and, as a matter of fact, He did appeal to His miracles in proof of His divine authority. The miracles are a part of the portrait of Christ: they are a part of that influence which has made the history of the Christian Church what it is. It is idle to speculate on what that history might have been, had that influence been different. We have to do with revelation as we have to do with nature,—as God has been pleased to make it, not as He might have made it, had His wisdom been as ours.'—*Ibid.* pp. 39, 40.

With regard to the remaining essays in this volume, we must confess that we are somewhat disappointed in them. We have nothing to object to the Bishop of Cork's diatribe on the Evidences of Christianity, but then neither do we feel that we rise from its perusal any wiser than we were before. The Bishop of Gloucester addresses himself to those who attach *some* preternatural efficacy to the Redeemer's sufferings for men, but propose to alter the terms in which it (we suppose he means the statement of it) is usually conveyed.

The passage at page 352, which exemplifies the writer's assertion that 'all the difficulties that belong to this question are introduced prior to it by a consideration of sin itself,' is the best part of the essay, but it only represents a view which any thoughtful mind must have formed for itself, that the difficulties of this subject, like those of all other parts of revelation, may be thrown in the teeth of the deist, who admits the existence of an infinitely perfect Being, and who is unable logically to reconcile his belief with the fact of the existence of physical and moral evil.

We will proceed to give a brief account of the principal historical essay in the series. Mr. Mansel undoubtedly bears away the palm for logic and philosophy, and Mr. Rawlinson is entitled to the same distinction in his own particular line of history. His object is not to notice any or all of the essayists, but to expose the weakness of all the attacks that have recently been made upon the Pentateuch, or, in his own words, 'to show 'first that there is no sufficient reason to doubt the Mosaic 'authorship of the Pentateuch; and, secondly, that there are 'no sufficient historical grounds for questioning the authenticity 'of the narrative.'

Mr. Rawlinson explains what he means by attributing the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses, by stating the following qualifications—

'Before the final close of this portion of the inquiry, it will perhaps be best to state distinctly in what sense it is intended to maintain that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. In the first place, it is not intended to assert that he was the original composer of all the documents contained in his volume. The Book of Genesis bears marks of being to some extent a compilation. Moses probably possessed a number of records, some of greater, some of less antiquity, whereof, under Divine guidance, he made use in writing the history of mankind up to his own time. It is possible that the Book of Genesis may have been, even mainly, composed in this way from ancient narratives, registers, and biographies, in part the property of the Hebrew race, in part a possession common to that race with others. Moses, guided by God's Spirit, would choose among such documents those which were historically true, and which bore on the religious history of the human race. He would not be bound slavishly to follow, much less to transcribe them, but would curtail, expand, adorn, complete them, and so make them thoroughly his own, infusing into them the religious tone of his own mind, and at the same time re-writing them in his own language. Thus it would seem that Genesis was produced. With regard to the remainder of his history, he would have no occasion to use the labours of others, but would write from his own knowledge.

'In the second place, it is not intended to deny that the Pentateuch may have undergone an authoritative revision by Ezra, when the language may have been to some extent modernised, and a certain number of parenthetic insertions may have been made into the text. The Jewish tradition on this head seems to deserve attention from its harmony with what is said of Ezra in the book which bears his name. And this authoritative revision would account at once for the language not being more archaic than it is, and for the occasional insertion of parentheses of the nature of a comment. It would also explain the occurrence of "Chaldaisms" in the text.

'Thirdly, it is, of course, not intended to include in the Pentateuch the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which was evidently added after Moses' death, probably by the writer of the Book of Joshua.'—*Ibid.* pp. 251, 252.

After having shown in the introductory part of the essay what are in brief the internal evidences in favour of the Mosaic authorship—and laying down as a canon, that except for special reasons, books are to be assigned to the authors whose names they bear, from which it follows, as a logical consequence, that the *onus probandi* lies with him who denies the genuineness of a given book—he declines to examine the different theories of authorship and composition which have issued from the Continent during the last half-century, on the ground that until it is shown that the book was not composed by its reputed author, the mode and time of its composition are not fit objects of research. He then proceeds to the authenticity. And here perhaps we may be permitted to remind theological students of the different meaning of the two terms genuineness and authenticity. In investigating the genuineness we are simply endeavouring to ascertain whether a book was written by the author who professes in the book to write it, or by him to whom it has been by common consent attributed. Thus the *genuineness* of the epistles of Phalaris has been disproved by Bentley, as it is plain from chronological and other considerations that

they were not written by the tyrant of Agrigentum, whose name they bear, and who is alluded to in them as their writer. The disproof of genuineness does not necessarily affect authenticity except so far as it throws doubt upon the veracity of other statements made by a person who has been convicted of a single falsehood or a forgery. Even in this case the work may be authentic as regards the main features of its contents, though its authority as to facts may be considerably damaged by its having been proved not to be genuine; and in case of the examination of the authorship of a work which contains no internal evidence who wrote it, but which has been generally ascribed to a given author, the genuineness has absolutely nothing to do with the authenticity. Thus the Epistle of S. Paul to the Hebrews is authentic, but its genuineness may fairly be called in question—Bishop Bull, we think, never quotes it as the work of S. Paul—but uses the phrase *divinus auctor quisquis ille fuerit*. The question of authenticity is then a question whether a book can be trusted and relied on for its facts and assertions. It may be remembered, however, that there are cases where the destruction of the genuineness of a volume carries with it also that of the authenticity. For instance, the epistles of Phalaris are perpetually alluding to what the supposed author did and said. Of course, if the authorship is disproved, any assertions as to what such an author said or did, are, though not necessarily false, brought into grave doubt, and are not entitled to credit unless well corroborated from other sources. It is plain that in the case of the Pentateuch the disproof of the genuineness would entirely invalidate the authenticity of at least large portions of it, but the establishing the genuineness by no means affords conclusive evidence of the authenticity.

Accordingly, Mr. Rawlinson, having set aside the question of genuineness by having shown that there are no sufficient grounds for calling it in question, proceeds to notice the arguments which have recently been raised against its authenticity.

The six principal points of attack on the authenticity are first enumerated. The truth of the Mosaic narrative is impugned on the score of its defective chronology, the destruction of the human race by a universal deluge, the mistakes of an ethnological character, the genealogies, the lengths of the lives of the patriarchs, and the alleged incompatibility of the duration of the sojourn in Egypt with the respective numbers of the Israelites at the commencement and conclusion of the period.

The argument against Moses on the score of chronology really only needs to be stated in plain language to enable any

person possessed of an ordinary amount of common-sense to see its absurdity. It owes its paternity to that arch-impostor Baron Bunsen, who as yet appears in this matter to have no disciples. For the sake of unlearned readers it seems worth while to state that the number of years from the creation to the birth of Christ, which, according to the ordinarily adopted chronology, is 4,004, has been computed from the three different documents which we possess at an amount varying from 4,000 to about 5,500 years, and that Baron Bunsen places the date of the existence of the first man in 20,000 years B.C. and that of the deluge at 10,000 B.C. At first sight it is evident that these numbers, if they are to be regarded as trustworthy, must, be made up from early documents or monuments. Now whatever may be the errors that have crept into a document full of figures, and no documents, it must be admitted, are so liable to error, there is, to say the least of it, some probability that the Hebrew text of Genesis—that of the Samaritan version, and that of the Septuagint—will give an average amount of years that will not be very far from the truth. At any rate, if the duration of the race of man from the creation to the Christian Era is not about four or five thousand years, we seem justified in asking for some documentary evidence in support of a theory which assigns twenty thousand as the probable number. Well, in support of this monstrous theory, and in face of the fact that no nation has any historical beginning earlier than twenty-eight centuries before the Christian Era, in face also of the fact that no monuments of human construction exist of so early a date as that, we have M. Bunsen's assertion that the historic records of Egypt reach up to the year 9085 B.C. when a sacerdotal monarchy was established, Bytis the Theban, priest of Ammon, being the first king. Before this time Egypt had been republican, separate governments existing in the different nomes, and that Egyptian nationality began as early as B.C. 10000. And these preposterous conclusions profess to be derived from Egyptian records, and 'from the monuments and other records.' Let us see what these records are. The whole theory, then, rests upon a version of a history of Egypt written by Manetho, an Egyptian priest of the fourth century B.C. which represents the government of Egypt from the time of Menes to that of Alexander as being under thirty dynasties of kings, occupying 113 generations, or about 3,500 years. The difficulties connected with this computation are inseparable, as there is no method for determining which of these dynasties, and how many of the monarchs, were contemporaneous. The period before Menes was considered by Manetho as consisting of 24,925

years, a period which he calls supernatural, during which Egypt was governed by gods, demigods, and spirits. Such is Manetho's description, and over this elementary account Baron Bunsen waves his enchanter's wand, and 9085 B.C. is the mystic number which turns up for the commencement of Egyptian history. Precisely the same evidence which was presented to Baron Bunsen's mind appeared to Sir Gardner Wilkinson to point to 2690 as the probable date of the accession of Menes, whilst Mr. Stuart Poole assigns the date 2717 B.C. to the same event. The reader will cease to wonder at the apparent ease with which Baron Bunsen produces his large numbers when he has read the following note from p. 257:—

'One method, however, whereby M. Bunsen exaggerates his Babylonian chronology seems worthy of notice. It is the method of *mistranslation*. Philo Byblius having observed in his work about Cities that Babylon was founded 1002 years (ἑρεσι χιλίους δύο) before Semiramis, M. Bunsen renders the words in brackets by "*two thousand years*," thus gaining for his chronology near a thousand years at a stroke. (See his "*Egypt*," vol. iv. p. 414, and again p. 491.)'

We trust future panegyrists of the German critic, in estimating his acquaintance with language, will not forget this delightful specimen of Greek scholarship.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Rawlinson has not exposed at greater length the ridiculous assumptions by which Baron Bunsen attempts to establish his long periods in Egyptian history. Any one who would give an analysis of '*Egypt's Place in Universal History*,' carefully noting what is fact and what is hypothesis, and pointing out the slender amount of premiss upon which the magnificent conclusion is based, would do great service to the student of history. Such a work, though it need not extend to any great number of pages, would exceed the limits either of an essay or review.

Mr. Rawlinson proceeds to notice the next great objection to the authenticity of the Pentateuch, viz. the narrative of the Flood. We do not think his account is here quite so satisfactory. We are inclined ourselves to the opinion that the Flood was partial as concerns the places and creatures overwhelmed and destroyed. It is sufficient for all purposes of theology, and it seems more consistent with natural history, to suppose that all the human inhabitants of the earth were destroyed with the exception of a single family. The attack rests upon very slight grounds, and we need not trouble our readers with noticing the reply. Passing by the notice of ethnological mistakes, so called, we proceed to the alleged mythical character of the genealogies. And here we shall let Mr. Rawlinson speak for himself.

'The mythical character of this same portion of the Biblical history has been further based upon certain supposed etymologies. Seth, we are informed represents, not a man, but God Himself, since Set or Sutekh was an old Oriental root for God, and Set or Suti continued to be an Egyptian deity. Enos is the same as Adam, since in Aramaic it means "man," as Adam does in Hebrew. Neither are real names of persons, but only ideal appellations for the first founder of our race. Enoch, "the seer of God," represents a religious period intervening between the time of the marauder Cain, and that of the agricultural builder of cities Irad. At the same time he is "the solar year," since the number of years which he is said to have lived coincides exactly with the number of days in that division of time. Cain and Irad are the respective types of the nomadic shepherd races and the agricultural dwellers in towns. The other patriarchs also represent epochs; and Nahor, the grandfather of Abraham, is the first real Biblical man.

It is clear that all history whatsoever may be made to evaporate under such treatment as this. If we may guess at etymologies, and then at once assume our guesses to be coincident with truth; if we may regard all significant names as mythic, and the personages to whom they are assigned as ideal, there is no portion of the world's annals which may not with a very little ingenuity be transferred to the region of myth. A witty writer noted some ten years since the certainty that, if such views prevailed, a famous passage from the ecclesiastical history of our own time would be relegated by posterity to that shadowy region; for how could it be doubted that such names as Newman, Wiseman, Masterman, Philpotts, Wilde, were "fictitious appellations invented by an allegorist, either to set forth certain qualities or attributes of certain persons whose true names were concealed, or to embody certain tendencies of the times, or represent certain party characteristics?" Similarly it might be argued that Athenian history, from Draco to Pericles, is mythical—that Draco was intended to represent the bloody and cruel spirit of the old aristocracy, Cylon their *crooked* courses, Solon the first establishment of a *sole* authority (for it would seem to be thought allowable to draw a derivation from a cognate dialect), Pisistratus the usurpation in which a chief *persuaded an army* to help him, Hippias, Hipparchus, and Thessalus, the time when, with the aid of *Thessaly*, the *cavalry* service was first fully organised, Isagoras the establishment of *democracy*, Clisthenes the *triumph of physical strength*, Themistocles the *ascendancy of law*, Aristides the completion of the *best form* of government, Pericles the age when Athens attained her *full glory*. Where names are significant, and their etymology is accurately known, it is generally easy to bend them into agreement even with the actual history of the time. How much more easy must it be, when their signification is unknown, to affix a meaning on plausible grounds which shall square with our historical fancies!—*Ibid.* pp. 273, 274.

Lastly, as regards the longevity of the patriarchs; the only account of facts we possess being that contained in the Book of Genesis, it seems rather absurd to say that such longevity is 'at variance with all the laws of human and animal organism.' This is just one of those statements which dabblers in science are afraid to impugn, lest they should betray the fact of their entire ignorance of the particular science whose conclusions are so definitely stated. In the absence of any evidence really entitled to be called scientific, it may be worth mentioning that—

'In the Hindoo accounts there are four ages of the world. In the first, man was free from diseases, and attained to the age of 400 years; in the second the

term of life was reduced to 300 years; in the third it became 200; and in the fourth 100. The Babylonian traditions gave to their early monarchs reigns of between two and three thousand years. The Greeks told of a time when men were children till they reached a hundred. Pliny mentions a number of authors according to whom men had lived 300, 500, 600, and 800 years. Josephus relates that the Egyptian, Phœnician, Babylonian, and Grecian historians united in declaring that there had been cases of persons living nearly 1000 years. It seems to be quite certain that a very wide-spread tradition existed in the ancient world, to the effect that the term of human life had been greatly abbreviated since man's first appearance upon the earth.—*Ibid.* pp. 578, 279.

The last objection is the unnatural rate of increase of the Israelites during the 430 years. And here we think there is no necessity to adopt the suggestion that when Jacob went down into Egypt, he took with him a company of a thousand souls, who, being circumcised, would be reckoned as Israelites. Neither does it form any the slightest objection to the narrative that the increase is one of unusual amount. To those who would measure the Israelites by the standard of other nations, and who, in so doing, entirely ignore the promise made to Abraham, the story presents an improbability of the very highest degree; an improbability, however, which instantly vanishes when you take into account the peculiar circumstances of the favoured nation. Mr. Rawlinson takes some pains here, and we think unnecessarily, to show all the circumstances which extenuate the difficulty and diminish the extraordinariness of the case. After all, the case is extraordinary, whether people choose to call it miraculous or not.

Mr. Rawlinson's essay concludes as follows—

'It appears, then, from this whole review, that there is nothing in the history of the world, so far as it is yet known, that forms even a serious objection to the authenticity of the Pentateuch. Were we bound down to the numbers of the Hebrew text in regard to the period between the Flood and Abraham, we should, indeed, find ourselves in a difficulty. Three hundred and seventy years would certainly not seem to be sufficient time for the peopling of the world, to the extent to which it appears to have been peopled in the days of Abraham, and for the formation of powerful and settled monarchies in Babylonia and Egypt. But the adoption of the Septuagint numbers for this period, which are on every ground preferable, brings the chronology into harmony at once with the condition of the world as shown to us in the account given in Scripture of the times of Abraham, and with the results obtainable from the study, in a sober spirit, of profane history. A thousand years is ample time for the occupation of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt, by a considerable population, for the formation of governments, the erection even of such buildings as the Pyramids, the advance of the arts generally to the condition found to exist in Egypt under the eighteenth dynasty, and for almost any amount of subdivision and variety in languages. More time does not seem to be in any sense needed by the facts of history hitherto known to us. The world, generally, is in a primitive and simple condition at the time of the call of Abraham. Men are still chiefly nomades. Population seems sparse; for Abraham and Lot find

plenty of vacant land in Palestine, and the descendants of Abraham experience no difficulty in overspreading several countries. Settled kingdoms appear nowhere, except in Egypt and Babylonia; and there the governments are of the simplest form. Art in Babylonia is in a poor and low condition, the implements used being chiefly of stone and flint. Yet Babylon is much superior to her neighbours, holds Assyria in subjection, and claims the second place in the history of the world. Her historical beginnings reach back, at the utmost, to B.C. 2458, while those of Egypt are probably but a very little earlier. All other nations acknowledge themselves younger than these two, and have no traditions even of their existence much before B.C. 2000. The idea that the Biblical chronology is too narrow, that it cramps history, and needs to be set aside in favour of a scheme which puts 10,000 years between the Deluge and the birth of Christ, is not one which has grown upon men gradually through the general tenor of their inquiries into the antiquities of different nations. It is merely the dream of a single historical enthusiast, who, devoting himself to the history of one country, and pinning his faith on one author—whom after all he exaggerates and misrepresents—has come to imagine that the additional time is required by the history of his favourite, and has then forced and strained the histories of other countries, with which he has no special acquaintance, into a distant agreement with the chronological scheme formed upon the supposed necessities of a single kingdom and people. As for the further requirement of another 10,000 years between the Deluge and the creation of man, it rests upon linguistic phantasies of the most purely speculative character. The remainder of the historical objections to the authenticity of the Pentateuch, though sometimes ingenious, have in them nothing to alarm us. Profane history is decidedly favourable to a Deluge extending to all races of men, and to the greater longevity of man in the earlier ages. Ethnological research tends continually more and more to confirm, instead of shaking, the account given of the affiliation of nations in the tenth chapter of Genesis. The more accurately old myths are examined, the more evident does it become that their tone and spirit are wholly different from the tone and spirit of Scripture. The Pentateuch has the air and manner of history; the Jews have always regarded it in that light; and modern historical and geographical inquiries, whenever they afford an opportunity of testing the accuracy of the narrative, are found to bear witness to its truth. Whatever may be the scientific difficulties in the way of a literal reception of some portions, historical difficulties of any real magnitude there are none. Internally, the narrative is consistent with itself; externally, it is supported by all that has any claim to be considered sober earnest in the histories of other nations. The Christian world, which has reposed upon it for nearly 2,000 years, as an authentic record of the earliest ages, is justified, by all the results of modern historical research, in still continuing its confident trust. There is really not a pretence for saying that recent discoveries in the field of history, monumental or other, have made the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative in its plain and literal sense any more difficult now than in the days of Bossuet or Stillingfleet.—*Ibid.* pp. 282—284.

We have not much space left to notice the remaining essays in this volume. We have already implied that as answers to the volume of 'Essays and Reviews' they are not very efficient. As containing the thoughts of able men as regards subjects much discussed at the present day, they are not without their value. We should be doing an injustice, however, to the author of the concluding essay of the volume, if we passed it over with this remark. If the other essays in the

volume may be spoken of as cold and dry, stiff, harsh and repulsive, and some of them more argumentative than conclusive on the points at issue, the essay on Scripture and its Interpretation is unquestionably entitled to the praise of reality and warmth of devotion. It is at once interesting and instructive, though it is distinctly polemical. It might be difficult to say, with regard to some of these papers, which of the obnoxious Essays they were specially levelled against. This is distinctly an answer to the last of the seven papers in the series of 'Essays and Reviews.' In some respects the combatants have some points of resemblance. Each strikes the reader as the most real and earnest writer of his party; each has an attractiveness amounting almost to fascination; and each strikes us as wanting that comprehensiveness of mind which can grasp the bearings of a whole subject. Mr. Jowett certainly penned a most telling sentence when he observed, that the differences in the interpretation of Scripture, as distinguished from all other books, are so great, that it requires an effort of thought to appreciate the fact. These variations Mr. Ellicott asserts to be neither so numerous or so important as is taken for granted. He justly remarks that these two statements amount only to assertion and counter-assertion, and makes the pertinent observation, that the proof of this would occupy more space than is assigned him; more than most readers would follow him through; and, in the end, would fail to be convincing on the ground that, whatever exhibition might be made of the amount of agreement among commentators, it would be thought a similar array of discordant and contradictory interpretations might be drawn up. We think the Dean of Exeter makes out a fair case as against Mr. Jowett, of having been guilty of exaggerating the amount of variation in interpretation of Scripture. At the same time, a better answer is required for such a charge than to show that it is exaggerated. With regard to his illustration of the subject, by taking De Wette and Meyer as two specimens of modern German commentators, and S. Chrysostom and Theodoret as instances of ancient writers, who, upon the whole, agree with them, we are at a loss to see what it proves, except that there is a certain amount of agreement as to the interpretation of Scripture among certain commentators. Mr. Ellicott would hardly wish it to be pressed to the extent which it will not bear, that there is any considerable agreement between these two and other writers of the present day. The principle of Protestantism is undoubtedly hard pushed by the variations in the explanation of texts of Scripture. If Scripture is to be the ultimate standard of appeal between individual and individual, we must confess we do not see what it has to stand upon.

After making all the allowances that can be made on the score of exaggeration, we think it cannot be denied that there is a great, and what on Protestant principles appears to us a most wonderful amount of variation in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. We say it is inexplicable on Protestant principles, because on Catholic principles there is no difficulty nor reason for astonishment in the matter. Taking Scripture as intended not to teach a new faith, but to confirm one which had been taught before, according to the expression of S. Luke, 'That thou mightest know the certainty of those things in which thou hast been instructed,' there is no such great amount of variation in its interpretation as given by those who were commissioned to teach it. And so, if seceders from the Church have wrested its meaning so as to represent it as favouring their peculiar tenets, that is only a phenomenon that might naturally be expected. The only subject for wonder then becomes, the countenance which, *prima facie*, certain texts in the Bible seem to lend to such doctrines. But even here the surprise will be considerably lessened when we think of the immense range, both of subject and of writing, comprised in this volume, and the isolated way in which a few texts are often detached from their context, and made to do duty, perhaps, in defence of a doctrine which they were intended to impugn, or in support of a theory to which they do not even indirectly allude. We are surprised that this view has not been put forward more prominently. We are persuaded that there is no other answer to be found to the objection against dogmatism on the score of the variation of interpretation of Scripture. Nor, again, have we ever seen any fair reply to another doubt of Mr. Jowett's, put out in the same essay, when he says, it is difficult to understand what is meant by 'proving from Scripture.'

In subordination to this view of the subject, which appears to us somewhat overlooked by the Dean of Exeter, we find much that we can agree with in following him through the second portion of his essay, in which, after admitting the great diversity of interpretation in individual passages and in details, he proceeds to assign this diversity to three different causes. The variations are said to result (1) from the fact that the Bible is different from all other books in the world, and its interpretation may therefore well be supposed to involve many difficulties and diversities; (2) from the words of Scripture having more than one meaning and application; (3) from the fact of the inspiration of Scripture. The last consideration really involves the other two, though there are manifest reasons why the three may be advantageously discussed separately. As a specimen under the second head we quote the following:—

'St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. iv. 8), not only makes a citation from a Psalm, which at the part in question appears to have a simple historical reference to some event of the time (perhaps the taking of Rabbah), but even alters the words of the original, so as to make its application to our Lord more pertinent and telling. What are we to say of such a case? Does it not really look like an instance of almost unwarrantable accommodation? Does it not seem as if we had now fairly fallen upon the point of our own sword, and that, in citing an example of a second meaning, we had unwittingly selected one in which the very alteration shows that the words did not originally have the meaning now attributed to them? Before we thus yield, let us at any rate state the case, and leave the fair reader to form his own opinion. Without at present assuming the existence of any influence which would have directly prevented the Apostle from so seriously misunderstanding and so gravely misapplying a passage of the Old Testament, and only assuming it as proved that there is one authentic instance of words of Scripture bearing a further meaning than meets the eye, we now ask which is to be judged as most likely: that the Apostle to substantiate a statement, which could have been easily substantiated by other passages, deliberately altered a portion of Scripture which had no reference to the matter before him, or that he rightly assigned to a seemingly historical passage from a Psalm, which (be it observed), in its original scope, has every appearance of being prophetic and Messianic, a deeper meaning than the words seem to bear (such a meaning being in one case, at least, admitted to exist), and that he altered the form of the words to make more palpable and evident the meaning which he knew they involved? We have no anxiety as to the decision in the case of any calm-judging and unbiassed reader. . . . One further remark we may make in conclusion, and it is a remark of some little importance, viz. that if the present instance be deemed an example of Scripture having a second and deeper, as well as a first and more simple meaning, it must also be regarded as an example of an authoritative change in the exact words of a quotation,—the change being designed to bring up the underlying meaning which was known to exist, and to place it with more distinctness before the mind of the general reader.'—*Ibid.* pp. 402, 403.

With regard to the inspiration of Holy Scripture, Mr. Ellicott attacks the statement of Mr. Jowett that the term inspiration is but of yesterday, and that the question of inspiration was not determined by the Fathers, by bringing a number of references to Fathers of all ages to show that they implicitly believed in the inspiration of Scripture. But here it appears to us the author has fallen into the same mistake with Dr. Wordsworth, in his criticism of the same passage. Mr. Jowett does not attempt to deny that the Fathers believed in the inspiration of Scripture, a fact which is patent to the observation of any one who has ever opened a volume of their writings. What he meant to do was to disparage the idea of inspiration, which he does not admit himself, by asserting that neither the ancients nor moderns knew its limits or were able to define it. We are far from saying that the allegation that the limits of inspiration are obscure requires an answer, or that it would be possible to give a satisfactory theory of inspiration, free from all liability to objection; and, acquiescing entirely in the view which is propounded in this essay, we regret the more that words should

have been wasted in defence of a statement that has never been impugned, viz. that the Fathers treated Holy Scripture as inspired. For ourselves, we frankly admit that there is no more possibility of distinguishing the exact limits of inspiration than there is of deciding between the ordinary and the miraculous. We are sorry even to appear to find fault with an essay which in almost every respect wins our sympathy and commands our respect. No essay of the series will bear any comparison with it in point of feeling. It is impossible to read any part of it without feeling sure that the author has thrown himself heart and soul into his subject—that he believes most firmly every word that he writes. It is perhaps the most interesting essay, and beyond all doubt gives us the very experiences of the writer's own life. In this respect it will be extremely useful. It will be felt that Mr. Ellicott has a right to speak as he does, not only because he has devoted much of his life to the interpretation of Scripture, but especially because he seems to express the very thoughts of his own heart, in attributing the following convictions to devout students of Holy Writ:—

'A third remark may be made on the negative side by way of complaint that we find so little weight assigned to the subjective argument, as it may be termed, for the inspiration of Scripture. In the sceptical writings of the day the argument is rarely stated except to be dealt with as a form of a natural but not very harmless illusion. Yet it is an argument of the greatest force and importance, and an argument which, if rightly handled, it is much easier to set aside than to answer. Is it nothing that the Bible has spoken to millions upon millions of hearts, as it were with the very voice of God Himself? Have not its words burned within till men have seen palpably the Divine in that which spake to them? Is it not a fact that convictions on the nature of the Scriptures deepen with deepening study of them? Ask the simple man to whom the Bible has long become the daily friend and counsellor, who reads and applies what he reads as far as his natural powers enable him; ask him whether longer and more continued study has altered to any extent his estimate of the Book as a Divine revelation. What is the invariable answer? The Book "has found him;" it has consoled him in sorrows for which there seemed no consolation on this side the grave; it has wiped away tears that it seemed could only be wiped away in that far land where sadness shall be no more; it has pleaded gently during long seasons of spiritual coldness; it has infused strength in hours of weakness; it has calmed in moments of excitement; it has given to better emotions a permanence, and to stirred-up feelings a reality; it has made itself felt to be what it is; out of the abundance of his heart the mouth speaks, and he tells us with all the accumulated convictions of an honest mind, that if he once deemed the Bible to be fully inspired on the testimony of others, now he knows it on evidence that has been brought home to his own soul. He has now long had the witness in himself, and that witness he feels and knows is unchangeably and enduringly true.

'Ask, again, the professed student of Scripture, the scholar, the divine, the interpreter, one who, to what we may term the testimony of the soul, in the case of the less cultivated reader, can add the testimony of the mind and the spirit—ask such a one whether increased familiarity with Scripture has quickened or obscured his perception of the Divine within it, whether it has led him to higher or to lower views of inspiration. Have not, we may perhaps anxiously

ask, the difficulties of Scripture wearied him; its seeming discordances perplexed, its obscurities depressed him? Have not the tenor of its arguments, and the seeming want of coherence and connexion in adjacent sentences, sometimes awakened uneasy and disquieting thoughts? What is most invariably the answer?—"No; far otherwise." Deepened study has brought its blessing and its balm. It has shown how what might seem the greatest difficulties often turn merely upon our ignorance of one or two unrecorded facts or relations; it has conducted to standing-points where in a moment all that has hitherto seemed confused and distorted has arranged itself in truest symmetry and in the fairest perspective. In many an obscure passage our student will tell us how the light has oft-times suddenly broken, how he has been cheered by being permitted to recognise and identify the commingling of human weakness and Divine power, the mighty revelation almost too great for mortal utterance, the "earthen vessel" almost parting asunder from the greatness and abundance of the heavenly treasure committed to it. He will tell us, again, how in many a portion where the logical connexion has seemed suspended or doubtful—in one of those discourses, for instance, of his Lord as recorded by St. John—the true connexion has at length slowly and mysteriously disclosed itself, how he has perceived and realized all. For a while he has felt himself thinking as his Saviour vouchsafed to think, in part of beholding truth as those Divine eyes beheld it; for a brief space his mind has seemed to be consciously one with the mind of Christ. All this he has perceived and felt. And he will tell us, perchance, what has often been the sequel; how he has risen from his desk and fallen on his knees, and with uplifted voice blessed and adored Almighty God for His gift of the Book of Life.

"The cold-hearted may smile at such things, the so-called philosophical may affect to account for them; they may be put aside as illusions, or they may be explained away as projections of self on the passive page, unconscious infusion of one's own feelings and emotions in the calm words that meet the outward eye. All this has been urged against such testimony, and will ever be urged even to the very end. But when the end does come the truth will appear. That witnessing of soul and spirit will, it may be, rise up in silent judgment against many a one who slights it; that testimony so often rejected as self-engendered and fanciful, will be seen to have been real and heaven-born, a reflex image of eternal truth, a part and a portion of the surest of the sure things of God."—*Ibid.* pp. 409–411.

We must refer our readers to the essay itself for an account of the author's theory of inspiration. We have neither space to give extracts enough to make it intelligible to the ordinary reader, nor to give an analysis of it such as would induce him to have recourse to the essay itself. We confess to a feeling that with all the moderation of tone which characterizes both this and other parts of the essay, the author much underrates the grave difficulties that surround every theory that can be given; though we fully admit that the difficulties are of a logical and argumentative kind, which may perhaps cause no uneasiness to a devout mind.

The last half of the essay is devoted to the proper method of interpretation. After a few remarks on the necessity of a preliminary preparation for the study of Holy Scripture by prayer, and recommending candour in statement of what seems probable, even though it appears to militate against all our preconceived

opinions, he proceeds to lay down four canons of interpretation:—

1. *Ascertain as clearly as it may be possible the literal and grammatical meaning of the words.* 2. *Illustrate wherever possible by reference to history, topography, and antiquities.* 3. *Develop and enunciate the meaning under the limitations assigned by the context, or, in other words, interpret contextually.* 4. *In every passage elicit the full significance of all details.*

Again we are forced to do a kind of unavoidable injustice to the author of this interesting paper by omitting the instances in which he exhibits the value of these four rules of criticism, and the manner in which they have been neglected. They seem so very commonplace that, perhaps, to some they will appear mere truisms, but no student will be tempted to despise them who knows anything of the errors both of fact and of doctrine which have sprung from inattention to them. The objections to them that they are so plain and evident, that they are in point of fact pretty much the method which would be adopted by any one in attempting to understand any difficult writer, seem to fall in with Mr. Jowett's advice, 'Interpret Scripture like any other book.' Accordingly, the author observes that, after he has condensed his canons into one, viz. interpret grammatically, historically, contextually, and minutely, the real point of interest yet remains to be discussed. If Scripture is unlike all other books, it might be expected that the rules applicable to the explanation of other books should be inadequate to the full interpretation of all parts of Scripture. Mr. Ellicott does not scruple to speak of his four canons as insufficient and incomplete, and that specially with reference to three large classes of passages:—1. Passages of *general* difficulty. 2. Passages of *doctrinal* difficulty. 3. Passages of *theological* difficulty. With regard to the first he furnishes us with the following canon—*Let the writer interpret himself.* This, though in words the same rule which might be advantageously applied to any writer, and is in fact the *Non nisi ex Aristotele ipso*, &c. commonly quoted as the rule for understanding the Greek philosophers, in its present relation has a deeper meaning. The rule, as applied to an ordinary writer of philosophy, would arise from the conviction that he would be consistent with himself; a rule which may even be stretched too far, and, perhaps, has in some cases caused, instead of removed, difficulties; but its peculiar significance in the present instance is derived from the 'express recognition of 'a general and pervading inspiration—an influence which, contrary to what might have been looked for in the case of a 'writer on subjects above man's natural power, kept the writer 'always in harmony with himself, and his words always self-explanatory and consistent.' The necessity of this addition to

the previously laid-down canons is shown by reference to passages which will not yield to ordinary rules of criticism, but which are satisfactorily explained on this principle. The transition of this canon to the next is obvious, though it involves an assumption which Essayists and Reviewers would, perhaps, scarcely like to admit. That unity and consistency which might naturally be expected in the different parts of the works of a single writer is claimed for the whole volume which we call the Bible. This is not much to ask of any one who believes in it as containing a revelation from God to man, but is probably more than will be conceded by many readers of the volume of 'Essays and Reviews,' or, perhaps, by some who may condescend to give a glance at the volume we are reviewing. Granting the hypothesis, however, the rule becomes one which it is impossible to object to—*Where possible let Scripture interpret itself, or, in other words, interpret according to the analogy of Scripture.* If the rule is to be considered absolute, it, of course, implies a belief in the inspiration of all parts of Scripture. That even this canon is not perfect, and requiring no supplementary rule, is evidenced by reference to the text, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, and our readers will, perhaps, anticipate the last canon as that with which they are in the habit of tacitly referring to in all their reading and study. *Interpret according to the analogy of Faith.* The author has thus most skilfully conducted his readers, by exhibiting the sheer necessity of the case, to that fundamental rule, without the recognition of which Scripture would be to the mass of readers either a dead letter or an apparent defence of heresy. Mr. Ellicott has reached, by what he himself call an inductive process, the very principle which the Church supplies us with in prejudicing the minds of her children, by thoroughly imbuing them with the doctrines of the Creed and the Catechism, before they are able to read the Bible for themselves. Of course every one will at once recognise that this is the real battle-field. Mr. Jowett has only enunciated the very watchword of Protestantism, but which Protestantism has been slow to adopt or to give publicity to, when he spoke of the Nicene definition as the greatest misfortune that had befallen Christendom. The objection shall be answered in Mr. Ellicott's own words:—

'Against such a rule, we are well aware, many an argument will be urged, many an exception will be taken. We have been told, and we shall often be told again, that to interpret by the Nicene or the Athanasian Creed is not only to mar the simplicity of Scripture, by bringing it in contact with what is artificial and technical, but consciously to involve ourselves in a plain and patent anachronism.

'To such mere assertions, for mere assertions they really are, it is not necessary, after what has been said, to return any formal answer. It may be

enough to make the two following remarks, and with them this portion of the subject shall be concluded:—*First*, the charge of anachronism may be readily disposed of by observing that, in thus interpreting Scripture, we are really interpreting it by what, in a certain sense, is anterior to it, viz. the principles of that faith of which Scripture is itself the exponent. *Ante mare fluctus*. What right have we to assume that all the early Christian preaching was only the outpouring of "attachment to a recently departed friend and Lord"? With what justice can we say that the whole of Christianity was contained in the words, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou mayst be saved," when, even in the very earliest of an Apostle's letters, there seems satisfactory evidence (comp. 1 Thess. v. 1, 2 Thess. ii. 5) that deeper things were communicated orally to the earliest Christian converts than were afterwards committed to writing? Most justly, then, has it been observed that, when we thus appeal to the principles of the faith for our guidance in expounding Scriptural difficulty, we are interpreting, not by "the result of three or four centuries of controversy," but by appeals to fixed principles of Christian doctrine, the greater part of which were known, believed, and acted on in the very earliest age of the Gospel. In succeeding centuries these fundamental truths may have been couched in terms of greater scientific exactness; the various controversies of the times may have caused the Church to put forth her doctrines in forms more technically accurate or more logically precise, but the substance was the same from the very first, and it is on that substance that our interpretation of Scripture is really based, it is to that essential truth of which the Church is a pillar, that we make our natural and reasonable appeal.

The *second* remark is this, that those who are much opposed to us in their estimate of the character and inspiration of Scripture, really in effect admit the principle we are contending for. To say nothing of the occurrence on their pages of such terms as "the analogy of Scripture," when the subject is the best mode of interpreting it, or of the silent but important admission that the principle which "enables us to apply the words of Christ and His Apostles" is neither more nor less than "the analogy of faith,"—to pass over all these tacit and almost instinctive recognitions of the one great truth (1 Tim. iii. 15), from which all that has been said above comes by way of legitimate deduction, let us merely take the rule which others have laid down, and fairly consider whether the recommendation to "interpret Scripture from itself" is not in effect and substance plainly identical with much that has been already advocated in these pages. Such a rule, in the first place, involves the very important assumption which we have above alluded to, viz. that Scripture is consistent with itself, even when such consistency might be appealed to as a very evidence of its Divine origin; and in the second place, after every possible limitation—viz. that we are to understand it to mean interpreting "like by like,"—such a rule is still, and must remain, based on the recognition of the sound and proper principle that Scripture difficulty must be explained consistently with Scripture truth. Of this truth the Creeds, especially the two shorter, are not only compendious but authoritative abstracts, summarily vouched for by the keeper of our archives and the upholder of their integrity, the Catholic Church of Christ. The same authority might justify us in similarly applying much of her own history and traditions as illustrative of Holy Scripture, if even not deserving the title of an aid in its interpretation. It may be sufficient, however, to claim the Creeds as authoritative summaries of Scripture, and so authoritative guides in interpreting Scripture, being in fact themselves the epitome of that from which it has been properly conceded that Scripture ought to be illustrated and expounded.—*Ibid.* pp. 445—447.

We should have been glad to offer a few remarks on the two remaining portions of this interesting and instructive paper,

and that the more because we do not exactly agree with the author's view as expressed in either portion. The penultimate section contains cautions, first, as to the application of type and prophecy; the author seems to write in sight, and almost in fear of objections which may be raised, or of ridicule which may be provoked by the allowance of any extended theory of typology and prophetic interpretation; and the instances which he gives show that he would be content to restrict himself within safe limits; yet, whilst we feel inclined to allow a wider latitude, we must acknowledge that we have been frequently provoked in such works as S. Augustine on the Psalms, &c. into denouncing such typical interpretations as puerile. In the last section we are inclined to think the author presses too closely the necessity of grammatical rules as regards the understanding of the Hellenic dialect of the New Testament. Those who are not familiar with the language in its Attic representation would only be puzzled by finding themselves confronted with rules where they would see no difficulties, whilst to the good Greek scholar they are superfluous. Those who have read Greek philosophy as it is read at Oxford, and have been accustomed to the study both of the New Testament, and of the specimens of Attic Greek that are commonly used at schools and colleges, can afford to dispense with 'ethical uses,' and the like.

Lastly, it seems right to say, that we have criticised without any scruple an essay which is in many respects above and beyond criticism. If Mr. Ellicott's essay must yield the palm on the score of intellectual power to the first essay in the volume, yet it is beyond all doubt the one which has interested us most. It was not meant to convert any of the writers of the obnoxious volume, neither is it the kind of essay that would have any chance of doing so; but we confidently anticipate that more good will result from its publication than from anything that has appeared on the subject of 'Essays and Reviews.' We must give the conclusion of it in the author's own words.

'Those against whom our observations have been directed will probably not be affected by anything that we have urged. The tone of self-confidence which marks their writings; the unfairness or, to use the mildest term, the slipperiness that pervades their arguments; the really cruel and thoughtless way in which they have allowed themselves to scatter doubt and uneasiness; their utter carelessness for the feeble, and the unstable, and the many who, with all their frailties and shortcomings, still deserve the name of "babes in Christ"—all these many painful characteristics make us feel that as far as they are concerned we have written and have spoken in vain. There are others, however, with whom it may not be so. There are kindly eyes that may have fallen on these pages, which, though not seeing wholly as we see, may yet have been encouraged to gaze longer and more earnestly, and to wait gently and patiently

for a glimpse of the fair landscape that lies beyond what now may seem to them only a cloud-land of eddying vapour and wandering storm. God in His everlasting mercy, for our dear Lord's sake, grant that it may be so! God grant that such may see and feel that these are no cunningly devised fables, no mere arguments put forward for love of controversy, no mere assumption of orthodox attitudes for the sake of self-interest (untrue and ignoble taunt of embittered opponents!), but a statement of earnest and serious convictions, which deepen with deepening reflection, to which every fleeting day bears its tribute of increasing assurance, which every prayer quickens, every blessing stimulates, every trial confirms. May they be moved to judge us thus kindly and fairly; and may our poor words be permitted in return to impart some comfort in anxieties, and to answer some of those doubts with which honest and good hearts are often permitted to be tried.

‘Lastly, may the great Father of love and mercy draw all who love His ever blessed Son, and who see in Him the propitiation for the sins of a whole guilty world, still nearer together. It may be, when all was well, we dealt hardly with each other, that we thought unkindly and spoke with bitterness. It may be even that we have acted in the same spirit, that we have helped to break up the household of faith into hostile camps, that we have smitten friends and brethren, and led those who would not use our shibboleths to the vale of slaughter and spared them not. But now the foe is on the frontier. If love is still cold, yet at least let danger reunite. Let us yield to instincts, if we care not yet for principles. Let us do only this, and it may be that even thus we may be allowed to see and feel that all was so ordered by a loving Father—that danger was to bring about reunion, and reunion to rekindle love. And then at last, with linked hands and united hearts, may we again join in praising and blessing our common Lord, evermore adoring Him who round our weakness and divisions winds the encircling bond of his strength and love, “round our incompleteness His completeness, round our restlessness His rest.”’—*Ibid.* pp. 468, 469.

ART. V.—1. *The Works of George Herbert.* In Two Volumes. Pickering. 1850.

2. *The Works of George Herbert.* In One Volume. Edited by the REV. R. A. WILLMOTT. Routledge. 1859.

AMONG the distinctive features of the present condition of English literature, not the least remarkable is the system now widely established of circulating libraries on a very large scale. These institutions—for, without exaggeration, they deserve the name—are of great service in keeping the dulllest village and the most sequestered country-house or parsonage in easy communication with the metropolis, the great centre of intellectual life. They are useful, too, for authors, and especially for those who have yet to acquire a name, as providing a machinery for introducing their works to public notice. They are useful for readers, as affording them an opportunity of pregustration—of glancing cursorily at what may be worth reading once, but once only; and of forming a more permanent acquaintance with those few rare works of genius or learning which, once seen, all who have the power, desire to add to their own libraries. Without doubt, in all this there are advantages which our grandfathers did not enjoy. On the other hand, these extensive libraries, with their fortnightly lists of the ‘new books’ which are continually struggling into the light of day, and rudely displacing their predecessors, are one among the chief causes of our neglect of such books as have not the recommendation of novelty. Even the great works of our living authors have only a brief popularity. The laureate’s latest poem, or the last, for the time being, of the brilliant and inexhaustible series of ‘My Novels,’ after being announced with all due ceremony, welcomed, discussed, devoured, is soon—not forgotten, that would be impossible—but laid aside among the things that have been, while the new favourite of the hour reigns in its stead. Still more is this to be regretted in the case of what is really literature of the past. Scott, for example, has never been surpassed, if equalled, as a novelist, yet any third-rate novel or ‘novelette’ of the day, vapid, incoherent, inane, is often taken up in preference, merely because *it is new*. It is not that there is anything in Scott to render him really obsolete. There is a charm in his exquisite graces of imagination and language that no lapse of time can ever wear off, even though, to our taste, his dialogues may seem stilted, and the pace of his narrative slow.

Of course, in history and travels, except for readers who have occasion to refer to original authorities, and, most of all, amid the vast and daily increasing acquirements of physical science, this superannuation of old writers is inevitable. Not so in works of fiction; not so in poetry, endued, as all true poetry is, with a perpetual youth. Yet even Shakespeare with us, though duly honoured, is, after all, seldom read, slightly known. But we need not pursue the subject further. It does not admit of question. We live too much in the present. Our ears are too preoccupied by the loud and impatient voices of the restless scene around us to listen to the calm, clear accents which speak from the far distance. We are in danger, it must be owned, of neglecting the treasures of the past, while, with contracted range of vision and hasty grasp, we care only to seize what lies close within reach as we drift along.

The particular author whose undeserved neglect suggests these remarks, is one whose name at least is well known, if his writings are not. In last year's exhibition of paintings, not a few among the gazers who crowded the Royal Academy's rooms were attracted round a small but highly finished picture, which, to say nothing of its other claims to be noticed (and these are considerable with all who can appreciate the delicacy, repose, and careful execution of Mr. Dyce's manner), certainly stood out in unique contrast to its companions both in subject and colouring. It transported the spectator from the many-coloured silks and whispered criticisms of the gay concourse of sightseers to a trim lawn, under the green foliage of spreading limes, beside a smoothly-flowing river. Here we see a solitary figure lost in thought, with half-spread book in hand, pacing slowly with steps timed to the peaceful flow of the stream. His refined, thoughtful cast of features, and grave clerical costume of James the First's time, together with the fishing-tackle on the bank, guitar resting against the trunk of a tree, and the shapely spire of his dear Salisbury Cathedral rising in the distance, plainly identify him as George Herbert. Although far too sensible a man to attempt to give such a distracted attention to different things at once, as this collocation of rod, book, and music seems to imply, still these accessories are not out of place, as giving some idea of the extent and variety of Herbert's tastes and pursuits. But the general impression produced by the picture is inadequate. It is rather that of a recluse, a visionary sentimental bookworm, than of a man who combined with the devotion and self-discipline of a Thomas à Kempis, the accomplishments of a perfect gentleman, the genial humour and shrewd, practical sense of a thorough man of the world. Mr. Dyce's picture, while representing well the serenity which

Herbert's impetuous nature gained by rigid exercise of self-control and resignation, illustrates only too well the popular misconception, universal among those who know George Herbert only by report. Most persons, we may venture to say, only think of him as, to borrow Mr. Spurgeon's elegant designation of him, 'a devout old Puseyite' of the time of the first Stuart, completely estranged from their sympathy, not by the antiquated manners of the period only, but by his own singular austerity of life, and extraordinary self-abnegation. Most persons merely know his poetry by a few lines culled here and there to provoke a smile at their quaintness and want of rhythm. Even among those who cherish with loving reverence the memory of his holy and beautiful life, few are aware—for it needs patient research, undiscouraged by the archaisms of a style strangely dissonant to our modern ears—how high a place he is entitled to, purely on the ground of intellectual ability. Among the rich legacies of literature bequeathed to us from the past, and fast being lost under the accumulating dust of ages, Herbert's 'Remains' especially deserve to be rescued from neglect, and restored to a place on our bookshelves and in our hearts. They are valuable, not merely or chiefly to the archæologist, but intrinsically; and, in particular, at the present time, as containing the antidote to many of the evils incidental to the tendencies of our modern literature. But we must proceed to adduce our reasons for claiming so high a niche in their gallery of worthies for one, of whom probably our readers have hitherto formed a far lower estimate.

In his own century Herbert's writings were popular enough. It is characteristic of his modesty, or, more strictly speaking, of the victory which he won over his naturally eager and ambitious temperament, that they were all posthumous in publication. The Poems seem to have been written before the 'Country Parson.' His preface to the latter is dated 1632, the year of his death; and its other name, by which it was more usually known at first, 'A Priest to the Temple,' seems to indicate that it was conceived in its author's mind as a companion volume to the already existing, though unpublished collection of poems, entitled 'The Temple.' These poems were evidently not the work of any particular period in his life, but the growth of years; kept under lock and key, according to the wise advice of Horace, until arrived at nonage. 'The Temple' was first given to the world in 1633, by Nicholas Ferrar, Herbert's literary executor; under his editorship it was printed by his daughters and other members of his household, or 'Protestant Nunnery' as it has been called, at Little Gidding, in Northamptonshire, and then published at Cambridge, after being, of course,

formally licensed by the Vice-Chancellor's 'imprimatur.'¹ In about forty years, so good Izaak Walton says in 1674, it passed through ten editions, more than 20,000 copies being sold; a success quite out of proportion to that of the far greater poet, of whose 'Paradise Lost,' shortly afterwards, only 1,300 copies were sold in the first two years, and only 3,000 in the first eleven years after its appearance. But the unpopularity of Milton's politics and theology easily explains this disparity, to say nothing of the inevitable repugnance, which even in those laborious days a profoundly learned and recondite epic, in twelve books, would have to encounter in the majority of readers. The 'Country Parson'—it is not plain for what cause—was not published till 1652. It would naturally attract scarcely any but professional readers, yet it went through three editions in twenty years. We cannot trace the progress of either volume through succeeding editions. The men of the eighteenth century were not likely to admire George Herbert. His style was too abrupt and unadorned for their elaborately rounded periods, his religious aspirations too glowing for their decorous conventionalities, his theology too patristic for their latitudinarianism, and, we may add, his thoughts at once too profound and too rudely chiselled for their polished but superficial philosophy. Till Pickering's costly and beautiful edition in 1840—one among many other instances of the good taste and too enterprising spirit of that publisher—there was no complete edition of George Herbert's works. But, as we begun by saying, they were honoured among their contemporaries. *Valeat quantum.* Let us try to estimate the worth of that popularity.

The Elizabethan era, towards the close of which George Herbert was born, has been called by some, who prefer its sturdy masculine vigour to the superior refinement of Pope and Addison, the Augustan age in English literature. It resembles rather the last days of the Republic, when the massive intellect of Rome was beginning to appropriate to itself the treasures of Grecian civilization. With equal avidity, and with equal inexperience and awkwardness at first, the great minds of Elizabeth's age, and of that which immediately succeeded it, seized the new stores of intellectual wealth laid open to them by the revival of classical learning, and by frequent intercourse with Italy, then, even more emphatically than ever, the land of art and song. That era may be compared to that delicious season of the year, the 'jocund month of May,' of which the poets of the time were never weary of singing the praises, combining at once the

¹ Many private papers of George Herbert were lost in the fire at Highnam House, Gloucestershire, the seat of Sir Robert Cook, the second husband of George Herbert's widow.

freshness and transparency of spring with something of the riper loveliness, without the languor of summer. The ruggedness, too, of the literature of those times finds its parallel in the sharp winds of May, of which we, the less hardy descendants of the men who repelled the Armada, are, with the exception of Mr. Kingsley, as his Ode to the East Wind shows, so apt peevishly to complain. It was an age of mother wit, as yet comparatively rude and unpolished, and of learning pursued as yet with too indiscriminating a voracity. The healthy appetite of the giants of those days, uncloyed by modern profusion, delighted in whatever it found, and was discouraged by no difficulties. We see in George Herbert at times, and more often in Milton and other contemporaries, something which looks at first sight like a pedantic ostentation of learning, but is really the mere exuberance of delight at discovering a vein of hidden ore. The great minds of that day were, after all, the masters, not the slaves, of their learning. Their originality was not stifled nor dwarfed beneath its weight. The very difficulties of the work gave an additional zest to it, and stimulated their faculties to the utmost. The severity of this discipline, for there was no 'royal road' to learning then, and few of those appliances which facilitate our journey, rendered whatever knowledge was acquired more real and solid, more thoroughly assimilated to the mind of the learner. To be a 'painful scholar' was great praise, and synonymous with being a good one. Books were then scarce and dear, and prized accordingly. When George Herbert wished to buy a new book at College, he was obliged, in spite of his liberal allowance, to 'fast for it,' as he writes to his father-in-law, Sir John Danvers, in order to indulge himself in so great a luxury. In these days of cheap paper and steam presses, we can hardly conceive the reverence then felt for anything in the shape of a printed book, almost as if a sacred thing. Nor is it easy for us, living in the whirl of incessant communication by the rail, the post-office and the telegraph, to throw ourselves back even for a moment into the deliberate movements, not in travelling only, but in speaking, writing, thinking, of the men of those days. As we trace their faded manuscripts, we see in their strong, square penmanship, with every single letter firmly and perfectly defined, the nervous and muscular grasp of the writers. It is the transcript of their character, of their energy, exactitude, perseverance. The succinct and condensed sentences, formal and stiff certainly, yet terser and racier than our comparatively loose and inarticulate style, express the perspicuity and reality, as well as the narrowness and slowness, of their conceptions. Hallam calls that age 'the most learned, in the sense in which the word was then taken,

that Europe has ever seen.' The limitation is important, as reminding us that inductive philosophy was yet in its infancy. The learned were more conversant with the unchanging laws of mind, inherited through the schoolmen from the Porch and the Academy, than with the fluctuating sciences of the material world. In its own way the learning of the Elizabethan and post-Elizabethan ages was prodigious.

But the peculiar characteristics of that age, which essentially distinguish it from our own, were, as we have already hinted, deliberation, earnestness, concentration of purpose. Men had a more leisurely, and yet a more painstaking way of thinking and acting, and a sense of enjoyment and repose in their work, not easily attainable in these days of high pressure. They could realise better than we the beautiful thought with which Milton consoled himself in the forced inactivity of his blindness—

‘They also serve, who only stand and wait.’

They could find hours, while we can scarcely spare moments, for undisturbed meditation; a habit of mind as much at variance with our mobile temperament, as the stillness of the old inns of court is unlike the din and turmoil of Fleet Street, which roars outside their gates. The feverish spirit of speculation, which in commerce makes or destroys a fortune in a day, and exercises the same perturbing influence even over our philosophy and literature, was altogether alien to the orderly and scrupulous habits of that age. The advantages of our own day are great, in the triumphal march of physical science, in the vastness of our intellectual horizon, in the richer complexity of our acquirements, and, above all, because the critical faculty is quickened and refined by long experience. But in this very diffusiveness of aims there is a great danger. We seem to want that closeness of concentration which stamps the Elizabethan age.

One among the best of our living poets, Mr. Matthew Arnold, in the preface to his volume of poems, complains of the want of ‘sanity’ in modern literature. There is an unnatural straining after originality, and an impatience of authority or control, which too often disfigure even our greatest works. The clever and popular ‘George Eliot,’ for example, may be taken as a typical instance in many respects, though not, we may hope, in all, of modern tendencies. The wonderfully graphic delineations of life and character are spoilt by bad taste, an unevenly balanced judgment, and a strange confusion in the ideas of right and wrong. It is a great relief to turn from such unwholesome exhalations of a false and unreal philosophy, to the bright, clear, buoyant atmosphere which Shakespeare and his contemporaries breathed. No wonder that the Elizabethan age attracts so power-

fully the sympathies of writers like Mr. Kingsley. They find there a hearty and robust geniality, a manly common-sense, an emancipation from modern subjectivity of thought, such as they delight in, while they are lenient towards the coarseness of speech into which that boyish exuberance of animal spirits was apt to degenerate. It would be great injustice to set down the age of Elizabeth and James as licentious and immoral, on the score of the occasional *grossièreté* of its drama. True, that the continental fashions then being imported from France and Italy, and by the Englishmen who served in great numbers in the debauched camps of the Low Countries, tended to corrupt the court. If we may judge from Howel's gossiping letters, Lord Dalgarno, in Scott's 'Nigel,' is no unfair sample of its profligacy. But this laxity of morals did not taint the great bulk of the nation—the country gentry living at home on their own estates, the stalwart yeomen of the country, the staid citizens of the towns. At no other period, perhaps, was the 'middle-class' (using that vague term to embrace both professions and trades), so generally sound at the core. Never was our commerce at once so daringly enterprising and so strictly honourable: never was the sanctity and happiness of domestic life so fully realised. Accustomed, as we are, to the pert slang of 'governor' for father, and accustomed, it must be owned, to relegate our religion too exclusively to one day in seven, we of this century may smile as we read of grown-up sons, high in office, making lowly obeisance at meeting father or mother, and may wonder that the constant presence of a chaplain was almost a matter of course in every large household. We are so used to see the common recreations of our working man of a low and debasing kind, that we can hardly realise the fact, that almost every family circle in those days in all classes, from the highest to the lowest, could while away the long bright summer evenings in the open air, or the dull afternoons in winter round the hearth, with glee, and round, and madrigal; each age and sex bearing its own part in the manifold harmony of the strain. There is something lost in all this. The Spartan-like deference for old age, the sense of religion as interwoven with the daily affairs of life, the love of music, with leisure to enjoy its cheering and elevating influences,¹ these are habits which no nation can well afford to lose.

But we must return to George Herbert. We have dwelt at length on the characteristics of his age, not merely to show cause why the verdict of his contemporaries should not be set aside as valueless, but also because the man and the age cannot be sepa-

¹ It was well said in an admirable article on 'Music,' since reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*, that the Elizabethan music is full of 'sound piety, broad fun, perfect freedom of speech, and capital eating and drinking.'

rated. He is, at the same time, a result of his age in some degree, and one of the efficient causes of it; being himself modified by its circumstances, while contributing to make it what it is. For this reason we must pause for a few moments longer, to count the long list of illustrious names which that age unrolls.

It was an age fertile in great men. Spenser was writing his 'Faery Queene' just about the time of George Herbert's birth. Raleigh's brilliant but erratic career reached its unhappy close while Herbert was public orator at Cambridge. While holding that office, and dividing his time as he did between the Court and the University, Herbert must have had frequent opportunities of seeing and hearing on the stage the marvellous creations of Shakespeare's genius, then in all the freshness of their first appearance. More exactly coëval with Herbert were Milton, and a galaxy of stars in the poetic firmament of far lesser magnitude and feebler lustre, of whom only a few scattered rays penetrate to us through the intervening mist of years, Daniel, Quarles, Wither, Drummond, Sandys, Suckling, and others. In theology there were Usher, Chillingworth, Hammond, Andrewes, Sanderson, and Hall, a strong array; in philosophy Hobbes and Selden; in jurisprudence Coke and Hale; in political life the Cecils, and many other truly sagacious statesmen; and, last in our enumeration, but foremost in philosophy, in law, and in affairs of state, the great Lord Bacon. We may add to the list Burton, whose 'Anatomy of Melancholy' is no bad sample of the quaint and miscellaneous erudition then in repute. But the drama was the distinguishing glory of those days. Then flourished, in the words of Southey, 'a race of dramatic writers, which no age and no country has ever equalled.' Ben Jonson, the founder of the English 'comedy of manners,' and, inferior only to him, in Hallam's judgment, Massinger; with Beaumont and Fletcher, Ford, Shirley. Such were Herbert's contemporaries; some of them, as Bacon,¹ Andrewes, Sanderson, his intimate personal friends; as were also Lord Pembroke, his kinsman, one of the chief actors in the important work of colonising Virginia, and governing the rising colony; Donne, Cotton, Ferrar, and Sir Henry Wotton, all men of no common ability, highly cultivated, and of a still more uncommon moral excellence. Certainly it was a rich soil, prolific of a healthy and luxuriant vegetation, the age in which George Herbert found himself.

It is impossible to approach Herbert's writing in an unpreju-

¹ Lord Bacon dedicated some metrical psalms to George Herbert; 'and usually,' says Walton, 'desired his approbation, before he would expose any book of his to be printed.'

diced state of mind, unless we first form a just conception of the writer. When the reader feels that he is addressed by one who has a claim on his attention, he is alive to beauties that might otherwise be unnoticed, less on the look-out for faults, can afford to overlook a few blemishes of style here and there—in a word, brings himself into that conformity of feeling with his author, which all artists exact by right as indispensable. Without this *provisional* sympathy, and even deference, no one can be a fair critic. We must divest ourselves at once of the vulgar notion of George Herbert. Far from being a mere devotee, planted on his solitary column in unnatural isolation, inaccessible to his fellow-men, he was emphatically a man of social sympathies, sustained and directed upwards by the entire devotion of his heart to heaven, as the tendrils of a vine are taught to ascend by the elm round which it clings. He loved to watch the ‘quidquid agunt’ of men, their business and pleasures, not with the contemptuous indifference of a Stoic or Epicurean, but as being all, if duly regulated, component parts in the order and beauty of the universe. Gifted himself with rare natural advantages, he neither neglected nor misused them. Excepting good health (for he was constitutionally delicate, and, in particular, subject to painful and weakening attacks of the ague, then far more prevalent and serious than in our days of good draining), hardly one of fortune’s gifts was wanting. He was born of a family noble in the truest sense of the word; for the name of Herbert was eminent then, as now, for the high character of those who bore it, with the difference that modern civilisation has elicited a more peaceful application of the same high spirit which distinguished the ‘fighting-men and men of renown,’ of whom Lord Herbert of Cherbury, with his usual complacency, reckons not a few among his ancestors. Well born and well bred, with a very prepossessing exterior,¹ with accomplishments of many kinds, and a sweetness of disposition that could not fail to win and retain friends, with abilities that raised him to one of the highest posts in the University at the early age of twenty-five, he started in the race of life with a bright prospect of success before him. His only fault, according to his brother, Lord Herbert, was that he was naturally quick-tempered, ‘not exempt from passion and choler;’ and Walton tells us, that ‘if in his undergraduate life he expressed any error, it was that he kept himself too much retired, and at too great a distance from his inferiors; and his clothing seemed to prove that he set too great a value on his parts and parentage.’

¹ One of his biographers, Archdeacon Oley, 1652, describes his person, in rather ludicrous terms, as ‘a contesseration of elegancies, and set of rarities to the beholder,’ and speaks of ‘his exquisite carriage.’

His allowance at college, we gather from his letters, though liberal, was not always sufficient for his rather expensive habits. Certainly in his after-life, as the 'country parson,' denying himself in every way for his parishioners, identifying himself with their homely lives, and lending a patient ear to every poor old woman who came with a story of distress, we see no traces of this reserve or exclusiveness, natural as it was to his fastidious delicacy of taste. He was the youngest but one of seven brothers, all men of note, and all apparently marked by a strong family likeness in high spirit and ability. The eldest, who raised himself to the rank of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, is well known to this day for his versatile talents as diplomatist and philosopher. The two next, Richard and William, after receiving a liberal education, served with distinction in the Low Countries, and were renowned according to the punctilious code of honour then in force, as duellists, Richard carrying twenty-four wounds with him to his grave at Bergenopzoom. Charles died young, a Fellow of New College. These four were George Herbert's seniors. But he seems to have been more closely drawn to the brother next after himself in age, who afterwards became Sir Henry, a favourite at court, at one time 'Master of the Revels,' and of course, like all the fine gentlemen of the day, famous in 'affairs of honour.' The youngest, Thomas, was a brave sailor. The brother of such men was not likely to be a bookworm.

George Herbert's naturally high spirits are evident in the few letters which remain, mostly belonging to the early part of his life. They are chiefly addressed from Cambridge to his brother Henry, and are very racy, considering the stiffness of letter-writing then in vogue. It is an instance of the chivalrous respect then paid to ladies, that while signing himself to Henry 'your loving brother,' he is 'your loving brother *and servant*' to his poor sick sister Elizabeth, wife of Sir Henry Jones. Writing to his brother at Paris, he tells him, 'be covetous of 'all good, which you see in Frenchmen, in knowledge, in 'fashion, in words;' and particularly in that 'wittiness of 'speech' which has always been a specialty of that nation. 'Let there be no kind of excellency which it is possible for you 'to attain to, which you seek not.'

About the same date he writes from Cambridge of having 'some forty businesses on hand,' and with equal relish of 'the gaynesses' incident to his office of public orator. In those days the Universities were in close communication with the Court, and to be distinguished at Oxford or Cambridge was a sure passport in political life. The office of 'public orator' was especially valued as an introduction to the Court; and a bright vista in that direction was opening itself to the young scholar-

courtier.¹ At first he hailed it gladly. Looking back afterwards on those sunny days from his quiet parsonage at Bemerton, he says:—

— ‘my birth and spirit rather took
The way that takes the town.’

But it is not in the tone of vain regret. He thanks the guiding Providence which diverted him by his bad health from the glittering prizes of that highway to greatness to the ‘fallentis semita vitæ,’ in which he was to serve God and his country. His intention of taking Holy Orders was clearly an afterthought; but that of leading a strictly religious life, even in the midst of secular avocations, clearly was not. He was not one of those, who, as Carlyle expresses it, ‘go through a mud-bath in youth, in order to come out clean.’ The dedication of all his powers to their highest use, whatever his way of life might be, at Court or in the University, was his fixed purpose from first to last, formed in very early life, and never laid aside for a moment, even in his ‘fierce’ youth, ‘eager, hot, and undertaking,’ as he himself describes it. In his first year at Cambridge he complains, ‘many love-poems are daily writ and consecrated to Venus, few that look towards God and Heaven.’ His delicate health was, no doubt, one cause that determined him to retire from the stirring scene of the Court. But he was also moved by a strong longing to raise the country clergy from the low estimation in which they were generally held, as the coffee-house squibs of that day show too plainly. Oley attributes this contempt of the clergy partly to the too indiscriminate admission of candidates first into the Universities, and thence into Holy Orders—for, as perhaps sometimes happens now, testimonials were given too much as a mere form—and partly to the general poverty of the country clergy, and the dearth of men of high family among them. It was a common thing then for their children to be apprenticed to trades. Herbert’s ‘Country Parson’ is described as ‘taking care not to put his children into ‘vain trades, nor unbefitting the reverence of their father’s ‘calling, such as taverns for men and lacemaking for women.’ Elsewhere chaplains are warned against being ‘over-submissive and cringing,’ and the rural clergy against haunting alehouses and taverns.’² Herbert resolved to set himself to rescue the

¹ Oley says, ‘he might have had a secretary of state’s place, like other orators.’

² Clearly it was not their poverty so much as their low tastes and pursuits that degraded them. The circumstances of the present day seem imperatively to require that neither low birth, nor scanty means, nor even a less perfect education than usual for gentlemen, should stand in the way of the admission of fit persons into holy orders, at least into the diaconate, for missionary work at home and abroad.

high vocation of the clergy from this loss of caste and consequent loss of influence.

But it was not without a severe inward struggle that he decided on that renunciation of pursuits, otherwise innocent, which the consecration of a man's life to the work of the ministry demands. If he came late to the work, he did not come empty-handed. Crowned with academical honours, and graced with the prestige of high social position, he brought his abilities, his reputation, his prospect of worldly success, and freely devoted them all to the work. He could truly say in a short poem, called the 'The Pearl,' that he knew the ways of learning, the ways of honour, the ways of pleasure, of love, of wit, of music, and, as Walton adds, 'he knew on what terms he renounced all 'these for the service of his Master.' In another poem, 'The Quip,' he personifies 'Beauty, Money, Glorie, and Wit,' as severally assailing him with raillery for his neglect of their fascinations; to each and all he replies by turning to his heavenly Master:—

'But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.'

Not as one seeking in the cool shadow of the Church a refuge from the glare of worldly disappointments, but with humble thankfulness, as feeling unworthy of the office, he undertook the responsibilities of the ministry. After retiring for a year to his brother Henry's house in Kent, there to pause before taking the irrevocable step, he was ordained deacon in 1625; and after four years passed in deacon's orders (for he imposed on himself this unusually long period of probation, and his diffidence was hardly overcome at last by the persuasions of Lord Pembroke and Laud, then Bishop of London), he was ordained priest, and appointed to the small rectory of Bemerton, in 1630, being then in his thirty-seventh year. His resolutions, formed on the eve of induction, and the rules which he then laid down for himself, are recorded by Walton. We must extract part of them. 'I beseech that God, who hath honoured me so much as to call me 'to serve at His altar, that as by His special grace He hath put 'into my mind these good desires and resolutions, so He will by 'His assisting grace give me ghostly strength to bring the same 'to good effect. And I beseech Him that my humble and 'charitable life may so win upon others as to bring glory to my 'Jesus, whom I have this day taken to be my Master and 'Governor. And I am so proud of His service, that I will 'always observe and do His will; and will always call Him '*Jesus my Master*. And I will always condemn my birth or any 'title or dignity that can be conferred on me, when I shall 'compare them with my title of being a priest, and serving at

'the altar of *Jesus my Master*.' In one of his poems he turns again and again with fresh delight to these words:—

'How sweetly doth "*my Master*" sound "*my Master*."'

With all his self-discipline and devotion George Herbert was not a man to be happy alone. Some little time before this crisis in his life he married a daughter of Mr. Danvers (a name well known in the county), of Bainton, in Wilts, a member of the same family as Lord Danby. It was a very short courtship. Walton naïvely says, 'she changed her name into Herbert on the third day after their first interview.' But, to say nothing of love at first sight, their families were already connected, and they had heard so much of each other through friends, that they met for the first time not as strangers, but as if long acquainted. 'They wooed so like princes,' Walton explains, 'as to have select proxies, such as were true friends to both parties.' One is reminded for a moment of Richard Hooker and his extraordinary marriage. But the cases are quite different. That learned, but, for once, *injudicious* divine, simply acquiesced in the choice of the landlady of his lodgings, who took the opportunity of nominating her own daughter. The proof of marriage is of course in its consequences. Every one knows how poor Hooker was found by a former pupil vainly endeavouring to give his mind to the great treatise which he had on hand, while rocking the cradle amid the objurgations of his Xantippe. But Herbert's married life was singularly happy. His wife proved herself worthy of such a husband.

The rest of his life is soon told. For little more than two years he lived and worked among his parishioners, and then his short, but useful and happy life, was closed by a deathbed in perfect unison with all that had preceded it, serene and hopeful as a cloudless sunset. Two years and three months may seem a disproportionate space of time for his work in the ministry, after so long and so careful preparation for it. But it is not for us to call his death premature. To himself the old adage may safely be applied—'his wings were grown'; and, as for his work, it was ended. '*Non diu sed multum vixit*.' His contemporaries complained that 'he lost himself in that humble way,' while devoting his energies to that obscure little parish. But his influence, in forming the highest type of Christian character for laity as well as clergy, has been extended, by his example and writings, far beyond the narrow limits of that little parish on Salisbury Plain, with its 'twenty cottages' and 'less than a hundred and twenty souls'—far beyond the age in which he lived.

It is not difficult, from hints contained in Walton's life, and

in his own sketches of the ideal 'country parson,' to form a tolerably complete idea of Herbert's daily life at Bemerton. The picture is a delightful one. His little church has lately been restored at great cost by the munificence of a lady worthy to bear the name, which he and others like him have ennobled in the highest sense of the word. As it stood in his day, with its low dovecote-like bell turret and narrow irregular windows, it must have been very like the homely but picturesque little churches which may still be seen often enough in Herefordshire, lingering amid other vestiges of the past in that old-fashioned district, and bearing witness, by their contrast to the statelier structures of the eastern counties, to the inferiority of western England in wealth and population. The romantic hills and dingles of Herefordshire are certainly as unlike as can be to the gently undulating plain about Bemerton. But there is, perhaps, no county which, at the present time, so nearly realises the truly pastoral relation which subsisted two centuries ago between a country parson and his people. In spite of the close vicinity of rampant Dissent in Wales, the old traditional respect for the Church and the clergy is still half-unconsciously cherished there among the peasantry and farmers; while each little parish seems to constitute only one large family, as described in Herbert's 'Country Parson,' with the parson himself acting *in propria persona*—not as in towns, through the mediation of curates and committees—the head and centre of everything that is going on, not excepting even the lesser and more trivial affairs of common life. In a little world of this sort we may imagine the poet-rector, loving and beloved by his flock, and revered by them not only for his office, but for his rank, learning, and sanctity—holding much the same position among them as the late Augustus Hare in his little parish on another of the Wiltshire plains. Herbert brought all the weight of his personal advantages to bear on his work, incommensurate to his powers, as it may seem, in worldly appreciation. He made his knowledge of the Platonic dialogues useful in the public catechising of the young people in church—a practice on which he set great store—borrowing the method of the sage, 'who taught the world as one would teach a child.' He used to entertain all his parishioners in turn at his Sunday dinner-table, welcoming the poorest with an especial share of that high-bred courtesy for which he was eminent even in a day when the etiquette of chivalry was still observed, and 'the grand manner' was more common among gentlemen than it is now. We may fancy him seated in his study, digesting his omnigenous stores of learning into a large common-place book—so he advises in 'The Country Parson'—but turning at any moment from the congenial occu-

pation to encourage any poor applicant for relief, who came to unfold a simple story of petty anxieties. His influence with the higher classes, always less amenable to such an influence, was as great as with the poor. 'There was not a man in his way,' writes Oley, '*be he of what rank he would*, that spoke awry in order to God, but Herbert would wipe his mouth (!) with a modest, grave, and Christian reproof.' He had a singular graciousness in reproving—always a disagreeable task—a dexterity in sweetening this art; a gentle yet uncompromising manner; a delicate tact in guiding conversation, which is wanting in persons of equal zeal, but less discretion. The eighteenth chapter of the 'Country Parson' gives some idea of this suavity and tenderness with unflinching firmness of manner; and, if such an art can be imparted by any rules, it may be by those laid down in the 'Church Porch.' Walton tells a story, illustrative of Herbert's winning manner, of his gaining a lasting influence for good over a gentleman living in Salisbury, by a short, casual conversation as they walked together, being previously unacquainted, on the road to that city. There must have been an irresistible charm about him, not the result of merely outward polish, but of innate sweetness of disposition and unselfishness, disciplined by the 'self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-distrust,' which were the results of his religion. It is no wonder that his flock followed him willingly, instead of being driven. 'When Mr. Herbert's Saints' bell [Sanctus-bell?] rang to prayers,' his neighbours, rich and poor, loved to resort to the little chapel adjoining his house, where the Church-service was daily performed 'at the canonical hours of ten and four.' Men 'would leave their plough to rest awhile, that they might offer their devotions to God with him, and then return to their work.' In our days of busy competition, even George Herbert would find it difficult to collect a large congregation in a small rural parish on a week-day. Herbert describes the country parson as observing the stated times of fasting and abstinence. The passage is characteristic of the man and his age. 'As Sunday is his day of joy, so is Friday his day of mortification, which he observes not only with abstinence of diet, but also of company, recreation, and all other outward contentments; and besides, with confession of sins and all acts of humiliation.' It was the general practice then. Of late years many religious persons have been deterred by fear of an observance which, more easily, perhaps, than any other, degenerates into formalism; while persons less serious have been only too glad to be freed from its restraint. Plainly, with George Herbert, it was no mere 'opus operatum.' There was no idea of anything meritorious in it. It was an ethical discipline for relieving the

'divinæ particula auræ' from the depressing burden of the 'corpus onustum.' His remarks in the tenth chapter show that he felt the obligation in the spirit rather than in the letter. 'If a piece of dry flesh at my table be more unpleasant to me than some fish there, certainly, to eat the flesh and not the fish, is to keep the fast-day naturally.' He goes on to say that fasting must never interfere with health, the preservation of sound mind in sound body being a paramount duty. We have dwelt at some length on this point, because the idea of Herbert and his contemporaries would be incomplete without it.

George Herbert was not one of those who sacrifice common everyday duties to those of a more directly religious kind, and who are so intent on the far distance as, in their abstraction, to be unconscious of the ground under their feet. The good parson is portrayed as exercising a general supervision, even over those departments of the household which do not usually belong to the 'pater-familias' to regulate. The following passage is very quaint. 'As he is just in all things, so he is to his wife also, counting nothing so much his own as that he may be unjust to it. Therefore he gives her respect both afore her servants and others, and half, at least, of the government of the house, reserving so much of the affairs as [may] serve for a diversion for him; yet never so giving over the reins but that he sometimes looks how things go, demanding an account, *but not by the way of an account.*'

His religion was not something distinct from the daily routine of life; it penetrated and ruled every action. If beggars, for example, come for alms, the parson takes the opportunity, before giving, of making them say their prayers, or the Creed, or the Ten Commandments; and as he finds them perfect, so rewards them the more.' His own household was managed in the same spirit. The tie between master and servant was closer and more affectionate then:—'Besides the common prayers of the family, the parson straitly requires of all to pray by themselves, before they sleep at night and stir out in the morning, and knows what prayers they say, and *till they have learned them makes them kneel by him.*' Herbert knew well the truth of Michael Angelo's great saying, 'These trifles make up perfection; and perfection itself is no trifle.' His devotion, being sober and unfanatical, never obscured the homelier duties of life. When some friend objected that he was spending too much in almsgiving, he could answer that 'a competent maintenance was secured to his wife after his death.' His parish never made him forgetful of friends or relatives.

'Meliorne amicus, sponsus, an pastor gregis
Incertum est,'

is the verdict of Dean Duport.

To complete our sketch, inadequate at the best, of George Herbert, at Bemerton, we must think of him as gracefully unbending at times from the tension of work, and joining in such social recreations as accorded with his profession. Twice a week, after walking in to Salisbury for the cathedral service, which it was 'his heaven upon earth' to attend, he would spend part of the evening 'at some private musical meeting, where he would usually sing and play his part.' We may imagine him, as really happened once, stopping on his walk, 'like the good Samaritan, and putting off his 'canonical coat to help a poor man with a poorer horse that 'was fallen under his load.' He arrived in Salisbury in such a state that his musical friends there 'began to wonder that 'Mr. George Herbert, who used to be so trim and neat, 'came into that company so soiled and discomposed.' We may fancy him, rod in hand, strolling along the river side, one of the 'gentle anglers' whom his friend Walton commemorates, shaping into verse his sacred meditations. Certainly a life like this, in which work and rest, self-discipline and natural impulse, secular duties and heavenly aspirations, are blended into harmonious unity, as in one of those rich strains of music, now grave, now joyous, but always duly measured, which he loved to follow; a life in which the coarser threads of existence are inextricably intertwined with, and transfigured by the radiance of, the more ethereal filaments; in which the calmness and equanimity which the Roman poet vainly longed for seems attained; is the highest and most complete development of human nature possible on earth. Monastic seclusion may secure peace by eliminating the elements of discord. 'They make desolation and call it peace.' A life like Herbert's calls into action all the component parts of our organization, and consecrates them severally to their appointed use.

It is his largeness of mind, quickness of sympathy, and practical sense, that we have been especially endeavouring to illustrate in George Herbert, for of his learning and piety there can be no question. We commend his life and works to the admirers of 'muscular Christianity.' True, Herbert had no share in Mr. Kingsley's horror of anything like asceticism, nor so unreserved a confidence in the undisciplined impulses of nature; still, they agree well in the warm appreciation of whatever is noble and beautiful, whether in the moral or material universe, and particularly in the great truth

that the work and excellence of man lies *in* the world and not *out* of it, and has a fruition in this life, though not in this life only. We might often fancy that we are reading the more didactic parts of 'Westward Ho!' or 'Two Years Ago,' in the genial, plain-spoken, thoroughly fresh and real moralisings of Herbert. Some few extracts we must give (for his condensed wisdom loses much by dilution), chiefly those bearing on the secular aspects of life. In the 'Parson's Survey,' not of his own parish only, but of what is now called 'the spirit of the times,' for the good parson is described as being also a good citizen, Herbert speaks of idleness among the young nobility as the 'great national sin of the times.' It seems to have been one of the newest fashions imported from France and Italy; as Shakespeare writes of a lackadaisical youth—

'For I remember, when I was in France,
Young gentlemen would be sad as night;
And all for wantonness.'

To remedy this evil (one not peculiar to that century), Herbert prescribes manly occupations. He recommends the young nobility to learn farming; to act as magistrates; to study civil law, the basis of international relations, and therefore especially useful to statesmen and diplomatists; to improve themselves by travelling abroad; "to ride the great horse"—that is, to acquire the accomplishments of the tiltyard. No doubt, if alive now, he would add the rifle corps to his list. His wisdom is not of a cloistered tone. On the other hand, it is far removed from the sharp practice of mere worldlings. It is, like the prudential maxims of the Book of Proverbs or Ecclesiasticus, the identification of duty with expediency. The 'Church Porch,' an introduction in verse to the other poems, reminds the reader of the best parts of Horace's Satires, not less by its 'pedestrian muse,' than by its shrewd wit and graceful pleasantry. It abounds in pithy sayings, such as may give a man not the manners only, but the principles and feelings of a true gentleman. Mr. Willmott well says, 'The "Church Porch" is a little handbook of rules for the 'management of temper, conversation, and business. Every 'child [?] ought to get it by heart.' Here is good advice tersely given:—

'Pitch thy behaviour low, thy projects high;
So shalt thou humble and magnanimous be.'

Here is a word for the over-sensitive:—

'Think not thy fame at every twitch will break.
By great deeds show that thou canst little do;
Then do them not.'

Beneath all the lighter raillery lies a profound vein of sentiment, the utterances of which sound like the voice of that great and wise king, who tried all things under the sun, and found them vanity. It is this keen sense of the ridiculous, as well as of the awful side of human life, which Shakespeare so well portrays in the melancholy Hamlet, and in the cheerier Pantagruelism of the young prince, the future hero of Agincourt. Herbert, in the same way, was one of the few who can realize at once the utter nothingness of even the greatest affairs of this life in one point of view, and the immeasurable importance of even the most trivial as forming the moral destiny. It is characteristic of him, that he translated the sensible little treatise on 'Temperance and Sobriety' of Ludovicus Cornarus, known to Italian scholars as Luigi Cornaro, of Padua; a delightful sketch of a hale and hearty old age, with rules for attaining it. Herbert seems to have had a peculiar aptness, both by nature and education, for casuistry; not for hair-splitting and sophistries, but for the 'noble art,' as he rightly calls it, of solving the perplexing cases of conscience which occur every day. His way of cutting these knots, or rather of disentangling them, is thoroughly English. It is the evidence of a healthy moral sense, practised in logic, but with its own unerring instincts unblunted. A few examples must suffice. He shows when it is wrong, and when not, to take usury—to inform against a neighbour—to omit customary acts of devotion; how far tears and other physical accompaniments of contrition are really essential or only accidental to it—how persons may test their motives in seeking preferment. On the question which often perplexes the benevolent, of giving relief to unworthy applicants, he advises to give *most* to those of best character, but *something* to any in distress; for evident miseries 'have a natural privilege and exemption from all laws.' His 'proverbs,' some apparently his own, others merely collected by him, which the reader will find among his greater works under the title of 'Jacula Prudentum,' leave hardly anything in life untouched. We quote at hazard two of the pithiest:—

'Marry your *son* when you *will*, your *daughter* when you *can*.'

'Buy at a fair, sell at home.'

We refer our readers to the rest, if they value the guidance of Herbert's aphorisms in the mazes of life.

The 'Country Parson' is, of course, the book by which Herbert is best known. Though intended primarily for the clergy, it is a book to delight readers of any profession by the charming series of portraits which it unfolds of the good pastor

in almost every conceivable attitude and grouping.¹ Oley, in his day, feared only that an ideal so faultless 'would make the laity discontented.' There can be no danger of this, now that so many of the clergy strive to raise themselves to Herbert's high standard. The literary merits, too, of the book are great. There is no fine writing in it; there are no grand passages. But the language throughout is choice, scholarlike, and equable; singularly simple, exact, and terse; above all, it is in perfect keeping with the ideas to be conveyed. If, indeed, the great thing in style is, as Aristotle teaches, to be 'clear and pleasing,' if the language ought to fit as closely yet easily to its ideas as a well-made dress to the limbs, then Herbert's prose must be ranked high. It is like a well-dressed person. The reader is unconscious where its charm lies; but if he change a word, or the place of a word, or add or take away anything, he discovers how exquisite, yet to all appearance, unstudied, is the composition. In this '*curiosa felicitas*,' Herbert's style resembles that of his friend, Lord Bacon. It is entirely free from the euphuism then in fashion at court, and its graceful ease is the more remarkable, considering the ponderous manner of the learned men of the day. Hallam, in his '*History of Literature*,' passes by the '*Country Parson*' too summarily. While allowing to it the faint praise of being 'a pleasing little book,' he objects that 'its precepts are sometimes so overstrained according to our notions as to give an appearance of affectation.' So much the worse, then, for us and 'our notions.' But a book on the life and habits of a country parson was not much in Hallam's way; nor was he likely, from the associations which environed him, to free himself from an unintentional prejudice against the theological school, in which, according to his 'notions,' Herbert would be classed. To the charge of being 'overstrained,' it is enough to answer that the precepts in question were laid down by the author as 'rules and resolutions' for his own guidance. 'He set the form and character of a true pastor,' he says, 'as high as he could, for himself to aim at; and he practised what he taught. Many useful manuals for the clergy have been written lately, testifying to their revived earnestness in their professional duties: Evans' '*Bishopric of Souls*,' Oxenden's '*Pastoral Office*,' Monro's '*Parochial Work*,' Tate's '*Ember Thoughts*,' Bishop Wilberforce's '*Ordination Exercises*,' and Blunt's admirable '*Lectures on the Parish*.' But the '*Country Parson*' can never be superseded.

¹ There is one curious omission. Not a word is said on the delicate relation between incumbent and curate. A chapter on the 'Parson and his Curate' would be useful to both parties. Herbert's silence on this point is the more remarkable from his having had a curate himself.

Short as it is and unassuming, it is inexhaustible in its suggestiveness. Walton says, 'He that can spare 12*d.* and yet 'wants a book so full of plain, prudent, and useful rules, is 'scarcely excusable.' It will never be obsolete. Here and there may occur something inapplicable to modern usages. Now that the ties of neighbourhood are less binding, it is not likely that, 'in case of any calamity by fire or famine to a parish,' all the inhabitants of an adjoining parish would go in procession, with the parson at their head, 'to carry their collection of alms themselves, to cheer the afflicted.' Nor would it be generally practicable now, though something similar is customary in some hotels, for the 'parson on journey' to assemble his fellow-travellers 'in the hall of the inn' for family prayers, 'with a due blessing of God for their safe arrival.' Still, in both cases, the principle holds good. Generally, his advice may be taken literally. His advice, for example, on the way of reproving, is as true now as then, and much needed by many zealous young clergymen. 'Those whom he finds idle or 'ill employed, he chides *not at first*, for that were neither civil 'nor profitable, but always *in the close*, before he departs from 'them: yet in this he distinguisheth; for if it be a plain 'countryman, he reproveth him plainly, for they are not sensible 'of fineness; if they be of higher quality they commonly are 'quick and sensible, and very tender of reproof, and therefore 'he lays his discourse so that he comes to the point very 'leisurely, and oftentimes as Nathan did, in the person of 'another, making them to reprove themselves.' Again, his remarks on reading the prayers in church are very seasonable, while complaints are heard continually of the bad elocution of the clergy; of their 'gabbling' in one church, of their 'drawling' and 'mouthing' in another. The parson's manner is thus described:—'His voice is humble, the words treatable [*sic*] and 'slow; yet not so slow as to let the fervency of the supplicant 'hang and die between speaking; but with a grave earnestness 'between fear and zeal, *pausing, yet pressing*, he performs his 'duty.' We would not, however, recommend our clerical readers to follow him implicitly, when he assigns no less than 'one full hour' as the time not to be exceeded in preaching; for the diffusion of books has changed the functions of the pulpit. There are preachers who may profit by his advice against over-analysing a text. The old story of 'let us *tap* this "*but*"' finds its counterpart in some pulpits in our day. On the difficulties of parochial work, there is much to be learnt from the 'Country Parson;' for example, on avoiding the danger of bribing the poor into an unreal profession of religion, while rewarding the most deserving.

One of the most beautiful and characteristic chapters in the book is 'the parson on Sunday.' In the description of Sunday as a joyous, as well as holy day, equally free from the interruption of wordly cares, and from the dull vacuity and gloom of ultra-sabbatarians, we see the cheerfulness of his religion. 'On the Sunday before his death,' writes Walton, 'he rose suddenly from his couch, called for one of his instruments, and having tuned it, he played and sang—

'The Sundays of man's life,
Threaded together on Time's string,
Make bracelets to adorn the wife
Of the eternal glorious King.'

Very beautiful, again, is the chapter on 'the parson in contempt.' Few, if any, clergymen can expect to go through their pastoral duties without incurring some degree of obloquy; too often in proportion to their fidelity to their charge. Those who

'feel bowed to earth
By thankless toil, and vile esteemed,'

may gather strength from Herbert's picture of a man, naturally sensitive like himself, raised above the susceptibility of injuries or affronts, 'showing that reproaches touch him no more than a stone thrown against heaven, *where he is and lives*.' But it is endless to make extracts. We must refer our readers to the book itself. Only one word more for the younger clergy, and we have done. They are in danger of becoming too much absorbed in their secular duties, of growing shallow and fussy, amid the countless distractions incidental to these days of penny magazines and penny savings' banks. They may learn from the 'Country Parson,' with his huge 'body of divinity, a book digested by himself out of writers old and new; the store-house of his sermons,' that they must rescue some portion of every day from such secular avocations, however laudable, as may be better discharged by lay agency, in order, by patient study, to lay a solid foundation of learning, especially in that great province of knowledge which is peculiarly their own.

Herbert's contributions to our controversial theology are less than might be expected from so learned and profound a theologian. He was naturally averse to publishing; and many of his manuscript papers were lost in the fire at Highnam House: besides, his early death may have prevented more. All that remains is gold, fine and unalloyed. In his short preface to his friend Ferrar's edition of the 'Divine Considerations of John Valdesso'—the companion of Charles V., first in his campaigns, afterwards in his retirement from the world—he touches cursorily, but with a master-hand, on several of the

great questions now agitating men's minds in England, his candour and comprehensiveness of intellect, and what may be called philosophical intuition, qualifying him peculiarly to answer such doubts and difficulties as are propounded in the 'Essays and Reviews,' so far as they came before him. He is so free from the conventionalities of religious phraseology, so philosophical, so calmly judicial, and, at the same time, so thoroughly real and earnest in his convictions, that whatever falls from him in defence of received truths carries no slight weight. Thus, while expressing the deepest reverence for the written Word of God as unfathomable in its meaning, or, to use his own words, 'ever teaching more and more,' he does not shrink from using the plainest language about such actions there recorded even of eminent saints, as would be censured in ordinary men. But he adds, 'it is one thing not to judge, another to defend them.' It is not, however, by passages directly bearing on the questions mooted in 'Essays and Reviews,' so much as by his general characteristics as a theologian, that Herbert's writings afford a solution of them. What especially marks his theology is, that reverence and free thought go hand in hand. He applies his consummate powers of reasoning to the question discussed, not as if himself standing aloof from it, or merely theorising on paper, but with intense personal conviction, and as qualifying the laws of thought by the plain dictates of common sense and common morality. He seems capable of realizing a mystery, without its mysterious nature evanescent in his grasp. Whatever truth, however abstruse, he handles, ceases to be a mere bodiless abstraction, and becomes a living reality. Thus, with him every article of the Creeds is a substantial unity, incorporated into his very existence. Though well versed in all the philosophy of the schools, there are no cobwebs of idle speculation in his reasoning to be brushed aside, before arriving at the truth. All is real, definite, actual, so far as regards the knowledge attainable by man; beyond that he does not presume to pronounce. His superiority to that habit of mind which wastes its energies in objectless unsatisfying speculation, and his repugnance to the intrusion of unauthorized definitions and dogmatisings into the illimitable field of heavenly mysteries, are evidenced in these lines. He is speaking of—

'Divinities' transcendent sky,
Which with the edge of wit they cut and carve;
Reason triumphs, and faith lies by.
'Could not that wisdom, which first brought the wine,
Have thickened it with definitions?
And jagged His seamless coat, had that been fine,
With curious questions and divisions?

Love God, and love your neighbour. Watch and pray.

Do as you would be done unto.

O dark instructions, ev'n as dark as day !

Who can these Gordian knots undo ?

It is the combination in Herbert's character of the practical and imaginative elements which renders him so eminently and thoroughly English.

He was by no means a partisan in theology. His orthodoxy was not of a partial and exclusive cast. He was one who would have symbolized heartily with the 'Evangelical' party in the fulness of their assertion of justification by faith: only, without losing sight of the other great truths handed down from apostolic times. He assents freely to Valdesso insisting on the supreme importance of faith; only adding, that from real faith all other graces are sure to spring. The words, 'I am less than the least of Thy mercies,' were ever in his thoughts and prayers. When his friends round his death-bed were reminding him of some good deeds which he had done, he replied, 'Not good unless sprinkled by the blood of Jesus.' He seems to have been as far removed from Arminian self-righteousness as from the licence of the Antinomians. Perhaps nothing better, in small compass, has ever been written on the great problem, how to reconcile free will and grace, than his lines, which begin—

'Lord, Thou art mine, and I am Thine.'

Again, on the vexed question of election, these few words speak volumes:—'The thrusting away of God's arm doth alone (and nothing else) make us not loved by Him.' It is a great loss that no copy remains of his 'Letter on Predestination,' which Bishop Andrewes valued so highly, that he always carried it 'in his bosom.' Herbert was one of the few who can appreciate the manifold aspects of every question as it may be regarded on this side or on that. He resembles Pascal in many ways; in fine wit, in profound, yet clear insight, in freedom from the narrowness of party spirit. His short poem against the invocation of saints is a remarkable instance of feeling duly balanced by judgment. He protests, elsewhere also, against Romanist errors, but always with temperance and consideration. No one need be surprised to find George Herbert identifying Papal Rome with Babylon, as if the matter did not admit of question. It was the way of his generation: a fact, which exposes the fallacy of an assertion, too often allowed to pass unchallenged, that the Reformers clung to the old tenets, and would have made a more sweeping reformation if living in these days. But this is not the place to pursue these theological questions. It is enough to repeat what no student of George Herbert's remains will deny, that it would not be easy to find a more perfect

representative than in him of the spirit of our English theology as embodied in our English Prayer-Book.

It remains to speak of Herbert's poetry. As might be expected, we find it almost ignored by critics like Ellis and Warton. 'Apage sus; non tibi spiro.' The former, in his 'Specimens of the Early English Poetry,' superciliously dismisses Herbert with a laboured antithesis, which betrays equal ignorance of the facts of Herbert's life and of the most salient features in his character. 'Nature intended him for a knight-errant, but disappointed ambition made him a saint!' Any one less Quixotic than George Herbert, or less like a man soured by worldly disappointment, can hardly be conceived. Warton, in a strange confusion of metaphors, speaks of Pope 'judiciously collecting gold from the dregs of Herbert, Gashaw,' &c. It would be nearer the mark to say, that Pope had penetration to detect the rich unpolished ore, strewn at random in Herbert's poems, and skill to give it new lustre by the charm of his elaborate workmanship. Hallam passes by Herbert's poetry without a word. Campbell, in his 'British Poets,' while devoting two or three pages apiece to the merest poetasters, can only spare the corner of a page, and half a dozen lines of preface, for George Herbert. But we must bear in mind the prejudices which rendered Herbert's writings 'caviare to the general' of late years. More surprising is it that Southey, in his continuation of Ellis, should mention Donne, Wither, and Quarles, without any notice of one certainly their superior as a poet. On the other hand, as we have seen, Herbert's poems made a great impression on the minds of the seventeenth century. Henry Vaughan bears witness to Herbert's influence as the originator of a new school in poetry. Baxter, the nonconformist, a man of no common ability, was a warm admirer of Herbert's poems. Even in our own day, the great poet-philosopher, Coleridge, again and again extols George Herbert, not as a man only, but as a poet. 'Let me add,' he writes in 'The Friend' [vol. i. p. 53], 'that the quaintness of some of his thoughts, not of his diction, than which nothing can be more pure, manly, and unaffected, has blinded modern readers to the general merits of his poems, which are for the most part *exquisite in their kind*.' In the 'Biographia Literaria' he speaks of the 'weight, number, and compression of Herbert's thoughts, and the simple dignity of the language.' He writes to his friend Mr. Collins, the Academician, 'Read "The Temple," if you have not read it.' Certainly, this is high praise from a great critic. Still, it must be owned that there is much in Herbert's poems to account for distaste on a first perusal. At first sight they seem, not here and there only, but throughout,

stiff, obscure, fantastic. Perhaps the reader casts aside the 'Sunday-puzzle,' as the late Bishop Blomfield nicknamed the 'Christian Year,' in utter perplexity, or with the exclamation which Plato provoked from a despairing student, 'Si nonvis intelligi, non debes legi.' But on a closer approach, and with patience, the mist clears off; and what seemed to be unsubstantial and impalpable conceits, 'airy nothings,' prove to have a form and substance well worth some trouble in deciphering. Coleridge says, truly, that the difficulty arises not from any fault in the expression, but from the very nature of the thoughts to be expressed. 'The characteristic of our elder poets,' and he cites Herbert as an instance, 'is the reverse of that which distinguishes more recent versifiers; the one (Herbert and his school) conveying the most fantastic thoughts in the most correct and natural language; the other, in the most fantastic language conveying the most trivial thoughts. The latter is a riddle of words, the former an enigma of thoughts.' Great allowance must be made for the influence of the Italian poets, with that fondness for quaint fancies, which may be seen in the frigid conceits and extravagant metaphors of Tasso and Ariosto—an influence from which Shakespeare himself was not exempt, as his atrocious puns show, and to which we may attribute the wretched acrostics of that period, in which it was the fashion for a lover to express his ardour, or a mourner his grief even on the memorial stone. Something, too, is owing to his patristic studies. As Oley says, 'You find in him the choicest passages of the fathers bound in metre.' Mr. Keble, again, characteristically traces much of this redundancy of imagery, 'and constant flutter of his fancy, for ever hovering round his theme,'¹ to an instinctive delicacy which shrank from exposing his religious feelings too openly before the eyes of the world. It is evident, also, that Herbert's neglect of poetical propriety was, in part, a reaction from the smoothness and unreality of the popular love songs of the day. In the last lines of a short poem, entitled 'Grief,' he gives way to the feelings of devotion struggling for a free utterance:—

'Verses, ye are too fine a thing, too wise
For my rough sorrows; cease, be dumb and mute;
Give up your feet and sorrows for mine eyes,
And keep your measures for some lover's lute,
Whose grief allows him musick and a rhyme,
For mine excludes both measure, tune, and time—
Alas! my God!'

In the same spirit he describes himself as at first seeking out 'quaint words and trim invention,' as fitting ornaments 'to

¹ *Praelect.* xxiv. quoted by Mr. Willmott.

deck the sense,' in speaking of 'heavenly joyes,' but at last abandoning the vain attempt, and resolving that he will, since

'There is in love a sweetness ready penned,
Copy out only that.'

Elsewhere he seems to long to rescue all the flowers of poetry, 'sweet phrases,' 'lovely metaphors,' 'lovely, enchanting language,' from all lower purposes, for a worthier use. We must remember, also, in criticising 'The Temple,' that it was not originally intended for publication. It was the literal transcript, where he found relief in recording his own religious experiences. On his death-bed he left 'this little book' for the hands of his friend Ferrar, adding, 'He shall find in it a picture of the many 'spiritual conflicts that have passed between God and my soul, 'before I could subject mine to the will of Jesus, my Master. 'If he can think it may turn to the advantage of any poor 'dejected soul, let it be made public; if not, let him burn it.' The too frequent recurrence of anticlimax, and even downright bathos, at the end of many of the poems, indicates that they were never properly revised by the 'last hand' of the author. All these considerations tend to avert the hasty condemnation which might otherwise fall on Herbert's poems as abrupt, rugged, and enigmatical; at any rate, they excuse the poet, even where they cannot alter our opinion of his poetry.

After all, it cannot be denied that Herbert, as a poet, never will and never can be a general favourite. The want of poetic diction—and it must be remembered that in his day the language of poetry was not yet recognised by tacit consent as distinct in many points from that of prose—the quaintness of his thoughts, and the homeliness of his phrases, are grave faults in the eyes of most people. Even the multiplicity and compression of his ideas make him unpopular, though it may satisfy a more critical taste, just as a thorough musician enjoys a closely compacted fugue more than flowing airs and melodies. His subject, too, is against him. The very names of his poems—'Faith,' 'Prayer,' 'Virtue,' 'Obedience,' 'Conscience,' to say nothing of other titles positively ludicrous to our modern ears—are a stumbling-block on the threshold, except to those who approach in a devout, or, as Coleridge preferred to say, 'devotional' spirit. To all others, the pervading sense of the unseen world in every line is as an unknown tongue, an unintelligible rhapsody. His words are, as the old Greek dramatists says, 'eloquent to those who go along with them,' but to none else. They are not likely to attract the uninitiated; their influence is rather in deepening and quickening religious feelings already existing. Like music in a minor key, his poetry does not command attention by a full

burst of sound, but quietly instils congenial musings into the attentive ear. All these causes are more than enough to relegate Herbert into the class of poets whose lot it must be 'to find fit audience, though few.' He would himself gladly acquiesce in such retirement, in the same spirit as that in which Wordsworth sings—

'Shine, poet, in thy place, and be content.'

Herbert's poetry can never be popular. But all true lovers of poetry will find hidden treasure there, if they have patience to search below the surface. There is the difficulty. It must be read *leisurely* to be appreciated. The eager, bustling spirit of our times is incapable, without some self-constraint, of comprehending those compressed utterances, the result of undisturbed meditation. Just as in a dimly-lighted room any one, who gives only a hurried glance, may turn away disappointed from a really fine painting, so it is only after a mental effort of fixed attention that the latent beauties of poetry like Herbert's can be descried. Then, and not till then, what seemed confused and meaningless comes out in light and shadow, disclosing the significance of even the minutest details. A short poem called 'Aaron' is an instance. Herbert is portraying the Christian minister as unworthy in himself, but as rendered worthy by the indwelling gifts of the great High Priest:—

'Holiness on the head;
Light and perfection on the breast;
Harmonious bells below, raising the dead,
To lead them unto life and rest:
Thus are true Aarons drest.

'Profaneness in my head;
Defects and darknesse in my breast;
A noise of passions ringing me for dead
Unto a place where is no rest:
Poore priest thus am I drest.

'Onely another head
I have, another heart and breast,
Another musick making live not dead,
Without whom I could have no rest:
In Him I am well drest.

'Christ is my onely head,
My alone onely heart and breast,
My onely musick, striking me ev'n dead;
That to the old man I may rest,
And be in Him new drest.

'So holy in my head,
Perfect and light in my deare breast,
My doctrine turned by Christ (who is not dead
But lives in me, while I do rest),
Come people; Aaron's drest.'

On a hasty reading, these lines sound as the merest extravagance. They are full of meaning to those who care to find it. The metre, too, is characteristic. At first, it seems cramped and inelastic; when grown more familiar to the ear, it has a plaintive sweetness of its own. Take, again, 'The Call':—

'Come my Way, my Truth, my Life;
Such a Way, as gives us breath;
Such a Truth, as ends all strife;
Such a Life, as killeth death.

'Come my Light, my Feast, my Strength:
Such a Light, as shews a Feast;
Such a Feast, as mends in length;
Such a Strength, as makes his guest.

'Come my Joy, my Love, my Heart:
Such a Joy, as none can move:
Such a Love, as none can part:
Such a Heart, as joyes in love.'

It only requires thought to see the deep connexion which underlies this string of apparently disconnected images.

Religious poetry is seldom of the highest order. The subject transcends human capacity: and the religious poet is liable to the danger of having his sensuous perceptions dimmed by the superior brightness of the immaterial world. Exceptions, indeed, there are few, but glorious. Among our countrymen, Milton stands alone in this category; Cowper, Keble, Trench, and some few others, occupying the next places. Many persons, who would otherwise never have dreamt of versifying, have published what is meant for poetry, solely under the promptings of strong religious feeling, as the prolific doggerel of our innumerable hymn-books testifies. To compare Herbert with the colossal genius of Milton would be preposterous. He is more nearly on a par with the others whom we have mentioned. If he wants their polished and musical diction, and is comparatively deficient in the variety of natural imagery and the tenderness of domestic pathos which belong to the poets of Olney and Hursley, he may be ranked above Keble in terseness and vigour, while his manly cheerfulness is a delightful contrast to the morbid gloom which throws its chilling shade over many of Cowper's most beautiful passages. In the general characteristics of profound and reflective philosophy, Herbert and Trench may be classed together. Between Herbert and Keble the resemblance is still more striking. The influence of the older poet is very perceptible throughout the 'Christian Year'—here and there in the very words of it.

It is interesting to trace the coincidences of these kindred minds. In the 'Flower,' which Coleridge calls 'a delicious

poem,' Herbert rejoices in the return of spring to the earth, and of spring-like feelings to his own heart, and proceeds:—

'These are Thy wonders, Lord of power,
Killing and quickening, bringing down to hell,
And up to heaven in an houre.
We say amisse
This or that is ;
Thy Word is all, if we could spell.' —P. 174.

In almost the same words, Keble exclaims:—

'These are Thy wonders hourly wrought,
Thou Lord of time and thought ;
Lifting and lowering souls at will,
Crowding a world of good or ill
Into a moment's vision.'

Sixth S. after Trinity.

In another place, Keble expresses the longing, such as even heathen philosophers felt, for the glorious emancipation of the immortal nature of man from its earthly elements:—

'Till every limb obey the mounting soul,
The mounting soul the call by Jesus given :
He, who the stormy heart can so control,
The laggard body soon will waft to Heaven.'

Twenty-third S. after Trinity.

The same thought occurs in Herbert:—

'Give me my captive soul, or take
My body also thither !
Another lift like this will make
Them both to be together.'

In both poets alike we see a natural inclination towards the attractions of the world checked by self-discipline:—

'I thought it scorn with Thee to dwell,
A hermit in a silent cell,
While, gaily sweeping by,
Wild fancy blew his bugle strain,
And marshalled all his gallant train
In the world's wondering eye.
I would have joined him, but as oft
Thy whispered warnings kind and soft
My better soul confest.
" My servant, leave the world alone ;
Safe on the steps of Jesus' throne
Be tranquil and be blest."'

First S. after Trinity.

So in 'The Quip,' which we have already referred to:—

'The merrie world did on a day
With his train-bands and mates agree
To meet together, where I lay,
And all in sport to jeer at me.'

And the 'merrie world' in the person of his representatives, 'Beautie,' 'Money,' 'Wit,' tries all his allurements, but in vain. Herbert writes, in his poem on 'Giddinesse':—

'Surely, if each one saw another's heart,
There would be no commerce,
No sale and bargain passe : all would disperse
And live apart.'

Keble has expressed the same idea more fully in his beautiful lines for the Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity:—

'Or, what if Heaven for once its searching light
Sent to some partial eye, disclosing all
The rude bad thoughts that in our bosoms night
Wander at large, nor heed love's gentle thrall.
'Who would not shun the dreary uncouth place?
As if, fond leaning where her infant slept,
A mother's arm a serpent should embrace;
So might we friendless live and die unwept.'

In both poets the consecutiveness of the ideas is often far from obvious, and must be sought beneath the surface. In Herbert there is less periphrasis in the expression of devotional feelings. Such outbursts as—

'Oh ! my dear God, though I am clean forgot,
Let me not love thee, if I love thee not !'

cannot be paralleled in Keble; they are characteristic of Herbert and of his age.

These parallel passages are interesting as marking the similarity of character which subsists in great and good men, even of very distinct individualities. The admirers of the 'Christian Year' will find much in 'The Temple' to remind them of their favourite passages. If 'The Temple' is never likely to exercise the extraordinary influence of the 'Christian Year'—an influence on the religious mind of England greater than has ever been exercised by any book of the kind, an influence extending itself imperceptibly even to quarters seemingly most alien—still it is a book to make a deep impression, where it impresses at all; and its influence is of a kind to percolate through the few to the many.

The resemblance between Herbert and Cowper is fainter; or rather a strong resemblance is qualified by equally strong traits of difference. Both poets have much in common with Horace, strange as any comparison may appear at first sight between them and the pagan poet of the licentious court of Augustus. They have no small share of his lyrical fervour, his adroitness in the choice of words, and in the adaptation of metres; and, in satire, the same light touch, the same suppressed humour, the same half-sportive, half-pensive strictures on the anomalies

of life. Both Herbert and Cowper love to dwell on the transitoriness of earthly pleasures; but there is this difference: Herbert oftener adds that man may enjoy them in moderation while they last:—

‘Not that he may not here
Taste of the cheer;
But as birds drink, and straight lift up their head,
So must he sip, and think
Of better drink
He may attain to, after he is dead.’—P. 134.

Both poets complain alike of times of religious depression; but Herbert’s lyre is more often tuned to joy and thankfulness for refreshment and relief. He was naturally of a more hopeful temperament. But there are other causes to account for the difference. That distrustful dread of alienation from the favour of heaven, which, in religious minds of Cowper’s school, seems even to overcloud the sense of reconciliation through the cross, was no part of Herbert’s creed. On the contrary, it was the very essence of his faith, a source of unfailing strength, to regard himself and his fellow-Christians as having all the privileges of adoption within reach freely to enjoy. Again, while poor Cowper’s mental vision was for ever introverted on himself, and busied with that dissection of transient phases of feeling which paralyses the healthy action of the soul, Herbert’s glance was oftener turned to the great objective truths of Christianity, deriving from them support in the consciousness of infirmity. Here is the secret of the *cheerfulness* of his poetry. This vivid realization of the great external facts of Christianity is what distinguishes him from the ‘erotic school’ of Germany. But for this, he might be classed with many of the poets of the ‘*Lyra Germanica*.’ But his poetry, though instinct with the same glow of seraphic love, is more definite, more practical, less sentimental. There is in it more substance for the mind to take hold of, more suggestiveness of something beyond, less evaporation into mere transports of emotion. His expressions of devout love, however eager and impulsive, are always (as in a short poem called ‘*Artillerie*’) profoundly reverential. Love and obedience, faith and duty, are with him inseparable. This habitual attitude of mind toward the Deity, this filial feeling of love tempered by awe, is beautifully apparent in the closing lines of another poem:—

‘But as I grew more fierce and wild,
At every word
Methought I heard one calling “*Childe!*”
And I replied “*My Lord!*”’—P. 160.

We have endeavoured to illustrate particular traits in Herbert's character, rather than to select his finest passages. Some few of these we feel that we ought to cite before concluding, especially as our author is one not so well known as he deserves to be. The beautiful lines on 'Virtue,' beginning

'Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright,
The bridal of the earth and sky,
The dew shall weep thy fall to-night,
For thou must die.'—P. 85.

are perhaps the best known, being quoted in Campbell's 'British Poets' and elsewhere. They are singularly applicable to Herbert's own life and character, and are redolent of the sweetness and brightness of his disposition. The 'Sonnet,' if we may use the word out of its strict signification, on 'Time,' and the lines on 'Love Unknown,' were both favourites with Coleridge. The former has been well compared to a collect in the Prayer-Book in its perfect rhythm, and in the fulness and compactness of its meaning. The latter is a short allegory, highly imaginative, and rich in devotional feeling. We subjoin a specimen of Herbert's more philosophic poetry, not unworthy of Wordsworth:—

'Man is the world's high priest; he doth present
The sacrifice for all, while they below
Unto the service mutter an assent,
Such as springs use that fall, or winds that blow.

* * * *

'We all acknowledge both Thy power and love
To be exact, transcendent, and divine;
Who dost so strongly and so sweetly move,
While all things have their will yet none but Thine.

'For either Thy permission or command
Lays hands on all."—P. 118.

Again, in 'The Search: "—

'Where is my God? what hidden place
Conceals Thee still?
What covert dare eclipse Thy face?
Is it Thy will?
O let not that of anything!
Let rather brass
Or steel or mountains be Thy ring—
And I will passe.
Thy will such an entrenching is
As passeth thought:
To it all strength, all subtleties
Are things of nought.
Thy will such a strange distance is,
As that to it,
East and west touch, the poles do kiss
And parallels meet.'

Our limits forbid any more extracts. We can assure our readers that, if they care to look for themselves, they will find many passages, not of a kind, perhaps, to make an immediate impression, but such as will approve themselves gradually more and more to a thoughtful and sympathising mind, and from which it may derive solace and strength.

Herbert's Greek and Latin poems need not detain us long. They evince his mastery over the idioms and metres of those languages; but like most classical compositions of his day, they seem harsh and strained, from the effort required to force the old languages to adapt themselves to modern ideas, for which they have no equivalent. His Latin letters are open to the same criticism. The redundancy of flowery compliments in them is also a fault of the period.

In our quotations we have referred to Pickering's edition of 1850, as being, in our opinion, the best extant. It is, as may be expected from the publisher's name, carefully and beautifully executed; in type and general effect perfectly in keeping with the author's age. The old spelling is retained, as in Mr. Keble's Hooker, and for the same reason, as assisting the reader to carry back his thoughts to the associations amid which the author lived and wrote. Mr. Willmott's edition betrays haste by its unpardonable inaccuracies both of spelling and punctuation, especially in the Latin letters, without even any list of the errata. In not a few poems the sense is quite obscured by their not being printed in form of dialogue. The notes, scanty and misplaced, are of little service, being attached generally to words that need no explanation, as, for instance, 'shrewd,' 'callow,' 'diurnall,' 'oblation,' 'glozing,' while passing by the few phrases that really present any difficulty. Mr. Willmott deserves thanks for adding a few short Greek poems: not that they are of any great value in themselves, but because they show the versatility of Herbert's genius, and his proficiency, not in Latin only (a common accomplishment in his day), but in the less trodden field of Greek literature. Mr. Willmott has done well in omitting 'The Synagogue,' a poor imitation, almost a caricature, of 'The Temple.' The omission of Walton's inimitable life is unaccountable; nor is it compensated for by the editor's own 'Introduction.' It might have been hoped, from an editor like Mr. Willmott, that he would have thrown some light on the connexion between the poet's life and particular passages in his writings. These omissions are the more to be regretted, as this edition is entitled to the credit of introducing an undeservedly neglected author in an attractive and popular form for general reading.

We have prolonged these remarks, we fear, beyond the

patience of our readers. In truth, we have been reluctant to quit a subject so fascinating. Men like George Herbert are rare. It is not his wide learning, nor his refined taste; not his high spirit, nor his amiability, nor even his strictness of life; it is not any of these qualities singly that distinguishes him: but the rare combination in one person of qualities so diversely beautiful. He was 'master of all learning, human and divine.' So writes his brother, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and his remains, few as they are, confirm this eulogy; yet his learning is not what strikes the reader most, it is so thoroughly controlled and subordinated by his lively wit and practical wisdom. He was exemplary in the domestic relations of life, 'tender and true' as son, husband, friend: yet he seems to have lived as a 'home-missionary' among his parishioners. He was a man of letters; yet ever condescending to the petty concerns of his poor ignorant clients: an ambitious man; yet he relinquished all worldly objects for the humble work of the ministry. He was, in a word, a man of extraordinary endowments, both personal and such as belonged to his rank—not lost in indolence nor wasted on trivialities, but all disciplined and cultivated to the utmost, and then devoted to the highest purposes. Men of a less evenly-balanced genius may create a greater sensation in the world; as the eccentric course of a comet may attract more notice than steadier and less startling luminaries. But it may be questioned whether the influence of men like George Herbert is not wider and deeper, though less perceptible, in the end. From them issue the hidden watercourses of thought and action that irrigate the world with ever fresh supplies of life and vigour by innumerable, unnoticeable rills, preserving its morality from corruption and stagnation. The influence of those who possess Herbert's natural ability, combined with his *solidity* of character, cannot be measured by what we see. It is to men of this metal that England owes her greatness—men, like him, of high spirit, strict principle, genial, practical energy—men who, over and above other fine qualities, are strong in that reality and earnestness on which we are apt to pride ourselves as peculiarly English. Such a hero, in the truest sense, England has but lately lost in Lord Herbert of Lea; such, in a different sphere of life, was his kinsman, the country parson of Bemerton. May the race of men like these never be extinct among our statesmen and our clergy! There is said to be a dearth of talent among the younger clergy now. The most promising young men in the universities, it is asserted, draw back from ordination, and prefer other professions. They may learn, from the example of George Herbert, how to devote their talents to a worthy end.

ART. VI.—*Missale ad Usus insignis et præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum. Pars Prima: Temporale.* Burntisland: e Prelo de Pitsligo. Londini: Veneunt apud C. J. Stewart. 1861.

THERE can be no doubt that the volume which stands at the head of this Article will form an epoch in the science of Ecclesiology. When we remember how difficult a thing it was to procure any copy of the Sarum Missal, at what a price the worst editions had to be purchased, how the increased study of the book augmented the cost by which it was to be obtained, it would have been a boon to English Churchmen, the value of which no words could express, to have their own original and dear service-book, to have that most precious work of S. Osmund, brought within the reach of the poorest scholar. But when, in addition to this, the Sarum Missal is presented to us with all its various readings, culled from a variety of editions which we shall hereafter particularize, so that we now have in our hands what must of necessity hereafter be esteemed the classical edition of our national Liturgy, we know not how we can return sufficient thanks to the promoter and principal editor of this publication. With the exception of one portion—and against that we shall be obliged to enter a protest—we can conceive no Christian work, such as this pre-eminently is, more laboriously, more scholarly, if we may use the word, more nobly performed than this has been. If our readers think that we are employing terms more enthusiastic than the volume itself warrants, we could not be satisfied to say less, especially as we shall have some censure to mingle with our praise. In the meantime, so far as the *Christian Remembrancer* has a right to speak for the Ecclesiastical students of the English Church, we confess to a debt of gratitude which, as it never has been incurred before, so, in the very nature of things, never can a second time be due to an equal benefit.

Before we proceed, we are bound to express our admiration of the way in which the volume has been 'got up.' Those who are acquainted with the Pitsligo Press, will only see in this Mr. Forbes's masterpiece; those who are not, will wonder that, under the direction of a priest, women—mostly converts from Presbyterianism—should have a living found for them by sending forth volumes which (at all events to an unprofessional eye) may vie with the best specimens of professional printers.

The present volume contains the first half of the Missal only,

the *Temporale*; the *Sanctorale* is reserved for a future issue. We need scarcely, however, observe, that this first part is infinitely the more important of the two; partly because in this we go through that series of the Church's year which is dear to, and known by, every Western Christian; partly—which, indeed, is a consequence of the preceding consideration—here we are in complete possession of its contribution to 'comparative' Liturgiology.

A short previous notice prefixed to the work, promises a detailed account of the editions of the Sarum Missal, when the whole task shall be accomplished. Instead of giving any abbreviation of the two pages which contain this statement, we will allow the editor to speak for himself:—

'It is only necessary to explain that the editions of which use has been made in the present work are designated by the year of publication; "92" meaning the edition of 1492; "34" that of 1534, and so forth. When more than one edition was printed in the same year, they are distinguished by the initial of the place of publication placed after the date; and when there is ambiguity also as to the place, the initial of one of the printers or publishers follows; where no name of place occurs, the initial of the printer is given. Thus, the edition printed in 1527 at Paris by Prevost is represented by 27PP.; that printed by Regnault by 27PR.; and editions of the same year, printed at Antwerp, and by Byrkman with no designation of place, by 27A. and 27B. At the end of the copy of the last-mentioned edition, which is in the British Museum, occur a few leaves of a different edition, which have been designated for convenience 27I.

'When an edition bears two dates, it is denoted by a fraction: the edition begun in 1510 and ended in 1511 is denoted by $\frac{11}{10}$; so likewise $\frac{55}{54}$ denotes the edition printed in 1554 and 1555.

'M54. denotes the Sarum Manual of that year; P with a figure following it, is the Sarum Processional of the year indicated; and B56. is the small Breviary of that year, printed at Paris.

'Before this edition was begun, a comparison of editions was made, sufficient to show a probable division into four or five classes, and some minor subdivisions. In the notes, only one edition of each class has been mentioned, except when it was observed that one edition differed from others of the same class.

'Wherever in the notes 94 occurs, the folio and the quarto printed at Venice in 1494 are represented, and also the very curious folio without date or place (probably earlier than the above editions), in the Gough Collection at the Bodleian and at the British Museum. This book, when it is referred to separately, is marked H.

'97. (of which there are copies in the Queen's Library at Windsor, in the British Museum, and belonging to the Duke of Devonshire) represents, 1. in the Douce Collection, 4PV. in the University Library at Cambridge, 8V. in the Gough Collection, and 10R. in the Bodleian and belonging to Mr. Mendham, as well as 27I. before referred to.

'15. (of which many copies exist) represents three other classes of editions—first, 3., secondly, the two Rouen editions of 8. and that of 9. (these three editions have much in common); and thirdly, the Rouen editions of 14. and 21.

'When this edition of the Missal was begun, it was conceived that twenty

editions; that of 1510 and 11 (designated by $\frac{11}{10}$), 13., 14P. and 27PP. (of which nineteen copies are known to exist), 16P., 19PH., 29. and 33. (of which sixteen copies are known), 21P., 26., 27A., 27B., 28. (of which fifteen copies remain), and 31., 32., 34., $\frac{55}{54}$, 55P., 55L., 55V. (of which thirty-four exist), differed very slightly from one another; as well as 19PR., 27PR., 30., and 54R. (of which fifteen copies exist), which had been less carefully examined; and that thus no less than ninety-nine copies would be found to differ but little from one another and might be taken as a kind of common standard edition. Circumstances also pointed out 26. as the edition most convenient to print from. But as the work went on, it was found that differences greater than had been anticipated existed between 13. and 26. and 55P.; and all that at present can be said is that 13. is believed to represent the first set of editions and (probably) the second; and that 26. represents the third, and the fourth also—where it is not noted that 55P. differs from it.

‘The four Pynson editions, 0L., 4L., 12., and 20. have some features in common, sufficient to warrant the classing them together, along with the last edition, that of 57. and perhaps 0P. In the notes, where 4L. and 57. agree, they probably represent this class.

‘The collations for this edition have been made by comparing together 94. and 57., 13. and 8RM.; and the Gradual with 4L. In these collations, no notice was taken of the variations in the Epistles and Gospels. While the work was in progress, 55P. was compared with 98. and 13.; and the results of all these collations compared afterwards with 92., 97., 15. and 26.’

In entering into further details, we must remind the reader that we are only fulfilling an engagement, made now some years ago, and worked out occasionally from that time to this, of examining in detail the principal offices of Christendom. We must therefore be forgiven if we here take for granted what we have elsewhere given reasons for believing; and assuming a knowledge on the part of our readers, which in foregoing articles has not been assumed.

The Sarum Missal, in the height of its glory, was in use through by far the greater part of England—that is to say, over that portion which lies southward of a line drawn from Chester to Lynn; it was, in spite of much opposition, the general use in Scotland; it was, to the best belief of the writer, though here he speaks on a most difficult subject, the national service book of Ireland; and, after the year 1390, or thereabouts, it was the office which extinguished all others in Portugal and Galicia, and which, to a great extent, prevailed in those Spanish dioceses that bordered on the before-named provinces.

But the editor has enriched the present work with extracts, by way of notes, from the Gradual—notes which it was utterly impossible for one scholar in a hundred otherwise to procure: Sarum Graduals being so excessively scarce, and, by consequence, commanding so high a price. Yet, without these annotations, some of the rubrics are utterly unintelligible, whilst some few even yet are, to say the least, obscure. We should

recommend that, as an appendix to the whole work, a ground-plan of the cathedral, as it existed in the fifteenth century, should be subjoined; the various elevations of the choir and sanctuary, the principal stalls and subsellæ, the altar arrangements, and everything else connected with the celebration of the Liturgy, being distinctly mapped out. Every ritualist who has really studied the rubrics of that Church which—we hope it is not national pride which leads us to say so—was, by the confession of all, the first Cathedral Church in Christendom as to ritual, must have felt himself sorely perplexed by the apparently contradictory directions given by them—directions which, we think, can only be explained on the supposition that the building was rearranged from time to time, while the ritual laws were varied in practice, but remained the same in letter.

If we class the Sarum Missal in its proper family, we shall find it occupying a position among those of the north and south-west of France, and of the whole of England, moulded apparently on the Missal of the Primatial Church of Rouen, but modified by the use of the Abbey of Bec: it, in its turn, reformed and reacted on by the whole of the churches which then owned English dominion. Of these, the principal were: Rouen, as we have said; next to that, S. George de Boscherville; then the Abbey of Jumièges, the mother of Notkerian Sequences; the rituals of Evreux, of the once famous Lisieux, of S. Lo, Caen, Bayeux, Amiens, S. Quentin, Fécamp; and, in the south-west of France, Bayonne, the leading ritual of that part of the country. In the beginning of the fifteenth century, by means of Lisbon, it had acted on Braga, Evora, Coimbra, and on the enormous abbey churches of Batalha and Alcobaça; while, penetrating into Spain, it had most distinctly influenced Tuy; in some small degree even S. Iago de Compostella; and, to a certain extent, Badajoz, Zamora, and Guarda.

We will now, in continuation of the papers which we have in former numbers devoted to comparative Liturgiology, compare some of the features of our own national rite, the *Usus Ecclesie Anglicanæ*, as some of the later Missals have it, with the Roman Liturgy, as the general touchstone of all, with the Rouen, and with our own modern Prayer-Book. We have previously spoken so much of the arrangement of Collects and Gospels, that we shall now take the Epistles in due course, and shall, as we go through them, notice any remarkable peculiarity of the *Usus insignis et præclaræ Ecclesie Sarum*.

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT. |

Sarum. Rom. xiii. 11—14.
English. Rom. xiii. 8—14.

Rouen. As Sarum.
Roman. Rom. xiii. 11—14.

The propriety of the Epistle is evident: it would be harder to say why the Prayer-Book takes the three earlier verses (8—11), which have no bearing on the subject, and spoil the exordium of the Church's year.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

All. Rom. xv. 4—13.

This Epistle is universal. The ritualists have nothing better to say on it, than that the mention of hope in the first verse, naturally leads us to the consideration of 'that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour JESUS CHRIST.'

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

<i>Sarum.</i>	} 1 Corinth. iv. 1—5.	<i>Roman.</i>	Philip. iv. 4—7.
<i>English.</i>			
<i>Rouen.</i>			

The Sarum and our own have a manifest reference to the Ember weeks which must follow; the Roman is surely not so appropriate here, as (where we place it) on the fourth Sunday. The counterchange of Epistles is singular. The German books follow us.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

<i>Sarum.</i>	} Philip. iv. 4—7.	<i>Roman.</i>	1 Corinth. iv. 1—5.
<i>English.</i>			
<i>Rouen.</i>			

CHRISTMAS DAY.

<i>Sarum.</i>	1. Tit. ii. 11—15.	<i>Rouen.</i>	} As Sarum.	
	2. Tit. iii. 4—7.			<i>Roman.</i>
	3. Heb. i.			
<i>English.</i>	Heb. i.			

taking the second Epistle for our second Evening Lesson.

But we will break the monotony of our list by giving an imitation of the very curious 'farced' Epistle (we have before explained the term) in the *Missa ad Gallicantum*; but only '*ubi habetur cantus.*'

¶ Let two clerks of the second form, in silk copes, together, in the Roodloft, chant the lection.

*For ever and for ever will I sing
The praises of the heavenly Lord and King,
Who formed us by His Hand; and saved from loss
By the Son's purple Blood upon the Cross.*

¶ And now alternately

A LECTON OF ISAIAH THE PROPHET.

*Wherein the Saviour's glittering birth
Is prophesied to all the earth.*

Thus saith the LORD :

*The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
By Whom were made the heavenly host :*

The people that walked in darkness—

*The people whom Thy hand hath made ;
The people who from Eden fell
By Satan's malice ; who, betrayed,
Were by Abaddon dragged to hell.*

Have seen a great light ;

*When, in the watches of the night,
The Angel-watches shone so bright.*

To them that sat in darkness, and the shadow of death, light

*Light and redemption all our own,
To future ages to be known,*

Hath sprung up.

*O admirable mystery !
O wonderful Nativity !*

For unto us a Child is born :

*He shall be great :
Jesus the Son of God Most High.*

Unto us a Son

Of Him That dwelleth in the sky

Is given :

As prophecies, revealed from heaven, relate.

And the government shall be upon His shoulder :

*That heaven above and earth below
His principality may know.*

And His name shall be called

Messias, Soter, Emmanuel, Sabaoth,¹ Adonai,

Wonderful

Root of David,

Counsellor

Of GOD the Father.

God,

Who all things by His word hath made.

The Mighty,

Who hell's foul gates in ruin laid.

The Everlasting Father,

*The Lord of lords, and King of kings,
Omnipotent o'er men and things.*

¹ A line from the Hymn (or Sequence) *Alma Chorus*.

The Prince of Peace,

That shall not cease.

Of the increase of His government

*At first in Hierosolyma,
In Jewry, and Samaria,*

And peace there shall be no end

Long as eternal years extend.

Upon the Throne of David and upon His Kingdom,

*And of that Kingdom shall be found
No limit or material bound :*

To order it,

(In faith to wit,)

And to establish it with judgment and with justice,

*When He, the Judge from Heaven, shall come
To call the world to final doom.*

From henceforth

*All laud and praise to Him is due,
And jubilation ever new,*

Even for ever.

¶ And now they both sing the rest together.

*From lands that see the sun arise,
To earth's remotest boundaries,
All nature raise her thankful strain,
And all the people say, Amen.*

With all our reverence for the rite of S. Osmund, we must call this perfectly intolerable ; Isaiah-and-water.

We now proceed.

CIRCUMCISION.

English. Rom. iv. 8—13.

Sarum.
Rouen. } Titus ii. 11—15.
Roman. }

The English Epistle is a curious example of the subjective character of the later book ; and probably also chosen for its reference to justification. Durandus gives no hint of its having been used in his time, nor can we find it in any other Missal.

EPIPHANY.

English. Ephes. iii. 1—9.

Sarum.
Rouen. } Isaiah lx. 1—6.
Roman. }

Again, in our present book, the instruction of the Epistle, rather than the rapture of the Prophecy ; which, however, forms the Lesson.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Isaiah lx. 1—6.	<i>Roman.</i>	{	Rom. xii. 1—5.
<i>Sarum.</i>			<i>English.</i>		

The Sarum does not, like the English and Roman, call this Sunday the First after Epiphany, but that within the Octaves: whence the Epistle is taken.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Sarum.</i>	{	Rom. xii. 1—4.	<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Acts iv. 8—12.
<i>English.</i>			<i>Roman.</i>		

The Roman Epistle refers to the festival observed on this Sunday: that of the Name of JESUS.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

All. Rom. xii. 16—21.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Sarum.</i>	{	Rom. xii. 16—21.	<i>Roman.</i>	{	Rom. xiii. 8—10.
<i>English.</i>			<i>Rouen.</i>		

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Rouen.</i>	}	Rom. xiii. 8—10.	<i>Roman.</i>	Col. iii. 12—17.
<i>Sarum.</i>				
<i>English.</i>				

The Sarum and Rouen Epistle is peculiar to these Churches. The German Missals have usually no proper Epistle, repeating that of the Fourth Sunday. Durandus mentions that which we have; and which we clearly borrowed from Rome.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Colos. iii. 12—19.	{	<i>Roman.</i>	1 Thessal. iii. 1—10.
<i>Sarum.</i>					
<i>English.</i>					

There can be no doubt that the English Epistle, 'we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him,' is the best: so often as that Sunday's office precedes Advent. The Roman is a late addition: in the time of Durandus no Church had any.

SEPTUAGESIMA.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	1 Corinth. ix. 24—27.	{	<i>Roman.</i>	1 Corinth. ix. 24—x. 5.
<i>Sarum.</i>					
<i>English.</i>					

The German books, so far as we have examined them, agree with the Roman in carrying on the lection into the next chapter. It certainly makes the sense much more complete:—
'lest . . . I myself should be a castaway: for I would not that

ye should be ignorant . . . that with many of them'—them to whom such privileges were given, God was not well-pleased.' Durandus, though not exactly saying so, *seems* to end it as the Sarum.

SEXAGESIMA.

Sarum. 2 Corinth. xi. 19—xii. 9. *Rouen.* } 2 Corinth. xi. 19—xii. 9.
English. 2 Corinth. xi. 19—21. *Roman.* }

But the Sarum has a rubric (in all editions but that of 1498) that, if the Epistle be said in the week, it is to begin at xi. 32.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

All. 1 Corinth. xiii.

There needs no explanation why at the time in which 'all our doings' are more especially to be devoted to our LORD's glory, we should ask to be endued with that grace without which 'nothing' can be 'worth' in His sight. We may observe that the Sarum books retain, to a very great extent, the ancient use by which Lent was not commenced till that which we now call, its First Sunday. Although this is more remarkably the case in the Breviary, it may also be noticed in the *Graduale* and *Complenda* of the Missal.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT, or *Invocavit.*

All. 2 Corinth. vi. 1—11.

And here, again, there is no difficulty as to the sense: 'Behold now is the accepted time.' The Epistle is the same in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT, or *Reminiscere.*

All. 1 Thess. iv. 1—7.

All the ritualists remind us that as, first and foremost among our spiritual enemies, comes the lust of the flesh—that sin of impurity against which the Epistle warns us; so here, first of all in Lent, the more general occasion of the Fast having been previously stated, we are brought face to face with this. One remark must necessarily strike every English Churchman: the miserable loss which we have sustained by the omission of the week-day Epistles and Gospels, during the great Forty Days. Take, for example, the course of the Liturgy for this especial week, the week in which we are now writing.

MONDAY.

The Collect.

We beseech Thee, O LORD, pour Thy grace into our hearts; so that as we

abstain from carnal meats, so we may hold back the flesh from every hurtful excess. Through Thy SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST: Who.

The Epistle.

2 Kings v. 1—15. (The History of Naaman.)

The Gospel.

S. Luke v. 23—30. (About the many widows that were in the land of Israel, during the days of Elijah.)

TUESDAY.

The Collect.

Hear us, Almighty and merciful GOD; and of Thy mercy grant to us the gifts of salutary continence. Through.

The Epistle.

2 Kings v. 1—7. (About the miraculous multiplication of the oil.)

The Gospel.

S. Matth. xviii. 15—22. (About telling a brother's fault to the Church.)

WEDNESDAY.

The Collect.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O LORD, that we, being instructed by salutary fasts, and also abstaining from hurtful vices, may the more easily obtain Thy pardon. Through our LORD.

The Epistle.

Ex. xx. 12, to the end. (From the beginning of the Second Table of the Commandments to the ordinance about altars.)

The Gospel.

S. Matth. xv. 1—20. (Our LORD's rebuke of the Pharisees about *Corban*, &c.)

THURSDAY.

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty GOD, that the holy devotion of these fasts may both bestow on us purification, and may render us acceptable to Thy Divine Majesty. Through.

The Epistle.

Jeremiah vii. 1—7. (About those who said, 'The Temple of the LORD are we.')

The Gospel.

S. John vi. 27—35. (Manna the type of the Blessed Sacrament.)

FRIDAY.

The Collect.

We beseech Thee, O LORD, favourably to behold our fasts; that, as we corporeally abstain from food, so we may mentally restrain ourselves from evil desires. Through.

The Epistle.

Num. xx. 6—13. (The second striking of the Rock.)

The Gospel.

S. John iv. 5—42. (The woman of Samaria.)

SATURDAY.

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that they who, by afflicting their body, abstain from food, through the following after righteousness, may in like manner also fast from sin. Through.

The Epistle.

The Story of Susanna.

The Gospel.

S. John viii. 1—11.

These are in general the same as the Roman. If it be thought that the Collects differ in words rather than in ideas, and that the Sunday *Oratio* might have done as well for the whole week, still it is a pity to lose all these Lent lections, so happily chosen in themselves, and so admirably knitted together. We are bound, by the way, to observe on the great convenience of the Scriptural references given in the present edition to verses as well as to chapters of our own version, in addition to the vague 'Cap. iv. A.' and the like, of the original books.

We need not go through the rest of Lent, because the Sarum, Roman, and Anglican Epistles agree; we will rather turn to another subject.

We said, at the commencement of this article, that, in one particular, we had a serious complaint to bring against our editor, and we now proceed to state it. It refers to the arrangement of the sequences; we mean the Notkerian sequences, of which species are the vast majority of those contained in the Sarum books.

First, let us lay down a few general rules.

(1) A Notkerian sequence contains an indefinite number of prose stanzas, or *troparia*.

(2) These *troparia* run, usually speaking, in couplets, sometimes in triplets, and answer to each other: α . in the number of syllables; β . to a certain degree, in accent; γ . very frequently in rhyme, or assonance.

(3) Each *troparion* is divided into a certain number of *commatisms*, answering to the commatisms of the responsive *troparia*.

Thus, in—

A. 1 Prophetas tu inspirasti 2 ut præconia Christi 3 præcinuissent inclyta.

B. 1 Apostolos confortasti 2 uti tropæum Christi 3 per totum mundum veherent.

A and B are responsive *troparia*; 1, 2, and 3, are the *commatisms*, also mutually responsive, 1 to 1, 2 to 2, &c.

Now, the question has not yet been settled, in what way these commatims should be represented to the eye.

It need hardly be said that, in the old books, they are not numbered at all. Of modern editors, Daniel takes no notice of them; nor does Mr. Neale; Mone breaks them up into short lines, thus:—

- 1 Prophetas tu inspirasti
ut præconia Christi
præcinoissent inclyta.
- 2 Apostolos confortasti
uti tropæum Christi
per totum mundum veherent.

But Mr. Neale endeavours to exhibit the mutually responsive troparia by marking them with the same italic letters; and our editor seems to have borrowed this practice from him; while, from Mone he has taken the separate lineation of each commatism.

Now, first of all; undoubtedly, in a collection of sequences, the editor has a right to give any metrical helps he thinks necessary; but, in editing a Missal, the matter stands on an entirely different footing. Here we want the exact reproduction of the matter which was sung according to the particular rite; not the editor's idea—let it be never so correct—of its arrangement. And this is especially the case with regard to commatims, the division of which must always be matter, to a certain extent, of mere opinion.

And there are two other reasons why the practice is inconsistent with editorial duty.

1. Very few writers, even in mediæval times, understood the laws of these Proses. Over and over again, in the Sarum Missal, unmetrical words were, by mistake, inserted. The editor cannot alter them, for he is giving, not the best possible edition of the sequence, but the sequence as it stood in the best edition of the Sarum Missal; therefore he must actually divide wrongly, must parallelize what cannot be parallelized, if he adopts any metrical disposition of the text.

2. But several of these sequences were actually written by persons who believed that they had no rules. Even Cluctoveus, in commenting on some of those which are most exact, says over and over again, 'Hujus prosæ solutus est contextus, nullâ-que rhythmî lege coercitus.' 'Hæc prosa solutam habet orationis compositionem, nec rhythmî legebus astringetur.' A curious example of a really prose sequence, composed by S. Mechtildis, is given by Mone. Some of the Sarum sequences are of this kind, and yet the editor has given them metrical divisions, as though they were capable of prosody.

Our first objection, then, to this arrangement is, that, in a classical edition of the Missal, it ought not to have found place at all.

But next, we must say that the actual arrangement is so very faulty, that we fear Hymnologists on the Continent, appreciating, as they must do, the immense labour and learning of the editor in other respects, will think their science at a very low ebb in England.

We will give an example: let it be the Sequence for S. John Evangelist. Thus it stands:—

- a.* Johannes, Jesu Christo multum dilecte virgo,
- b.* Tu, *c.* ejus amo *-d.-* re, carnalem
- b.* In *c.* nave paren *-d.-* tem liquisti.
- e.* Tu lene conjugis pectus respu *-c.-* isti, Messi *-d.-* am secutus.
- e.* Ut ejus pectoris sacra meru *-c.-* isses fluen *-d.-* ta potare.
- f.* Tuque *g.* in terra positus, gloriam conspexisti Filii Dei,
- f.* Quæ so *-g.-* lum sanctis in vita creditur contuenda esse perenni.
- h.* Te Christus in cruce triumphans matri suæ dedit custodem,
- h.* Ut virgo virginem servares atque curam suppeditares.
- i.* Tute carcere flagrisque fractus testimonio pro Christi *d.* es gavisus.
- i.* Idem mortuos suscitās, inque Jesu nomine venenum *d.* forte vincis.
- k.* Ti *-g.-* bi summus tacitum cæteris Verbum suum Pater revelat.
- k.* Tu *g.* nos omnes precibus sedulis apud Deum semper commenda,
- l.* Johannes Jesu chare.

Now, in the first place, a TROPARION CANNOT END IN THE MIDDLE OF A WORD, any more than could a line of a metrical hymn so end. The reason is manifest: because the cadence of the music *there* comes to a full stop. We need not say that to arrange a sequence with certainty (so far as the troparia are concerned) is IMPOSSIBLE, unless we have the music. Most assuredly the Editor here had the Gradual by his side; but had he taken it in connexion with this sequence, he *could* not have so disfigured the latter. Let us now endeavour to represent it as it ought to be printed; distinguishing the responsive troparia by responsive italics, and the commatiments by straight lines; and giving our reasons as we go on.

- { (*a*) Johannes, Jesu Christo
- { (*a*) Multum dilecte virgo.

Observe here how syllables and accentuations agree: also the final rhyme, *Christo,—virgo*.

- { (*b*) Tu ejus amore | carnalem in navi | parentem liquisti.
- { (*b*) Tu leve conjugis | respuisti pectus | Messiam secutus;
- { (*b*) Ut ejus pectoris | sacra meruisses | fluentia potare.

Notice first: that *nave*, not *navi*: *respuisti pectus*, not *pectus respuisti*, seem the better readings.

- We have then; 1. A ternary system of troparia.
 2. Each troparion has three commatims.
 3. Each commatism has six syllables.
 4. The second commatism always rhymes to the third.

navi—liquisti.
 pectus—secutus.
 meruisses—potare.

And so, taking the second and third of the three first troparia,
 conjugis—pectoris.

We would ask the reader to compare the simplicity and completeness of this arrangement, with that of our editor.

{ (c) Tuque in terrâ positus | gloriam conspexisti | Filii Dei.
 { (c) Quæ solum sanctis in vitâ | creditur contuenda | esse perenni.

This does very well; but there is another reading—"in *viâ* positus"—*via*, of course, being the grand old mediæval contrast between the journey *here*, and the PATRIA *there*. Therefore, very probably we should read

{ (c) Tuque positus in *viâ* | gloriam, &c.
 { (c) Quæ solum sanctis in *viâ* | creditur.

by means of which slight alteration the two commatims respond excellently well as to contrasted sense, and furthermore rhyme with each other.

{ (d) Te Christus in cruce triumphans | Matri suæ | dedit custodem
 { (d) Ut virgo Virginem servares | atque curam | suppeditares.

It will be observed, that *c* and *c*, and *d* and *d*, rhyme.

{ (e) Tute carcere flagrisque fractus testimonio | pro Christi es gavisus :
 { (e) Idem mortuos suscitâs, inque Jesu nomine | venenum forte vincis.

This is an example of responsory troparia where the division of commatims must be a matter of doubt. Read the former line, and you would make the first commatism end at *fractus*; but then you come to the impotent conclusion of *inque* in the second. Read the second line, and you would pause at *suscitâs*; but then you halt lamely at *flagrisque* in the first.

{ (f) Tibi summus | tacitum præ ceteris | Verbum suum Pater revelat :
 { (f) Tu nos omnes | sedulis precibus | apud Deum semper commenda.

This is the usual reading, but it will not do. The first and third commatims answer well enough; but the second has, in *f* 1 seven syllables; in *f* 2 only six.

The Sarum books have it, *tacitum ceteris*, with the sense:

'To thee the FATHER revealed That WORD, Who, in comparison 'with that which He told thee, was silent to others.' But we rather prefer the other reading, *tactum præ ceteris*: 'The WORD Which thou, beyond all others, didst touch:' thus referring to the Last Supper, and the Beloved Apostle's leaning on our LORD's breast; and also with allusion to his own words: '*quod vidimus, et manus nostræ tractaverunt de Verbo Vitæ.*'

(a) *Johannes, Christo care.*

The sequence ends with a troparion which echoes the first; and thereby shows that *Johannes Jesu Christo multum dilecte Virgo* should be printed as we have printed it.

We may now, however, say a few words with respect to the general character of the Sarum Sequences.

It is a singular fact that, among all the European nations which received sequences as an institution, there are two, and only two, widely distinguished classes. The one introduced the Notkerian, the other the Metrical, proses. It is well known that the origin of sequences themselves is to be looked for in the Alleluia of the Gradual, sung between the Epistle and the Gospel. During this melody it was necessary that the deacon should have time to ascend from his place at the altar to the rood-loft, that he might thence sing the Gospel. Hence the prolongation of the last syllable in the Alleluia of the Gradual, in thirty, forty, fifty, or even a hundred notes; the service of which ritualistic writers speak so much. True, there was no sense in this last syllable and its lengthening out, but the mystical interpreters had their explanation: 'the way in which we praise God in our Country is yet unknown.'

And good people were content for some three hundred years with this service; and, as it has been very truly observed, the attempt itself, if one may use the expression, to explain the sound into sense, has a little of the rationalism with which the Eastern has always taunted the Western Church. But, towards the beginning of the eleventh century, there was a certain Swiss monk, by name Notker. The defects of every religious person were well known in the house where he resided; and a slight lisp in his speech gave him the surname of *Balbulus*. He had resided for some years in that marvellous monastery of S. Gall; the church of which was the pattern of all monastic edifices, till it was eclipsed by a church, the description of which now reads like a most glorious dream—Cluny. While watching the samphire-gatherers on the precipitous cliffs that surrounded S. Gall, Notker had composed the world-famous hymn, 'In the midst of life we are in death.' But, desirous of obtaining the best education which Christendom could afford, he afterwards

betook himself to the Monastery of Jumièges, and there formed an acquaintance with many of its monks. With one of them he had, it seems, a friendly discussion, whether the interminable *ia* of the Gradual might not be altered into a religious sense; a discussion which, for the time, had no result. But Jumièges, in common with so many other French monasteries, was desolated by the barbarian Normans. Whereupon Notker's friend, bethinking himself of S. Gall, took refuge in that great house; and the discussion which years before had commenced, was again carried on between the two associates. At length Notker determined to put words to the notes which had hitherto only interminably prolonged the Alleluia. He did so: and as a first attempt, produced a sequence which began with the line—

‘*Laudes Deo concinat orbis universus* :’

and which has lately been republished. He brought this, notes and all, on a parchment rolled round a cylinder of wood, to Yso, precentor of, what we should now call, the *Cantoris* side. Yso looked kindly on the composition, but said that he must refer it to Marcellus, the precentor on the *Decani* side. These two sang the sequence over together, and observed that sometimes two notes went to one syllable in a slur, sometimes three or four syllables went to one note in a kind of recitative. Yso, thereupon, was charged with the message that the verses would not answer their purpose. Notker, not much discouraged, revised his composition; and now, instead of (for the first line) *Laudes Deo concinat orbis universus*, he substituted *Laudes Deo concinat orbis ubique totus*: instead of the second line, *Coluber Adæ deceptor*, he now wrote, *Coluber Adæ male suasor*: which, as he himself tells us, when good-natured Yso had sung over to himself, he gave thanks to God, he commended the new compositions to the brethren of the monastery, and more especially to Othmar, Yso's brother by blood. Such then was the origin of sequences, at first called proses, because written rather in rhythmical prose than with any attention to metre.

The next stage was to make them strictly metrical, and with rhymes—usually speaking, double rhymes. This culminated in Adam of S. Victor, from whence such compositions have taken the name of Victorine. England and Scotland seem to have been the only countries where the earlier species was to the last the favourite.

The Sarum rite certainly does not stand high in its order of sequences. France takes the lead: her various offices possess some 200 of first-rate merit; and if we select the twelve Victorines which probably claim the first place, nine of them are of

French origin. It is singular that the unapproachable *Dies iræ*, and that which most persons (not however the present writer) would consider the second, *Stabat Mater*, should be Italian, as also another that claims a very high place, the *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*. The rest of the first twelve would probably be *Læta-bundus* (S. Bernard): *Heri mundus exultavit: Splendor Patris et figura: Zyma vetus expurgetur: Lux jucunda, lux insignis: Laudes crucis attollamus: Superna matris gaudia: all by Adam:—Mittit ad Virginem*, by Abælard:—*Verbum Dei, Deo natum*, by Henricus Pistor:—and *Potestate non naturâ* (author unknown).

The Sarum Missal has many of Adam's; indeed, almost all the Victorines it does contain are very good. But the majority of the Notkerians, which appear chiefly of English manufacture, are very poor; such, for example, as *Nato canunt omnia*, for Christmas: *Resant sacrata*, for Whitsuntide: *Christi hodierna*, for Christmastide. Peculiarities are:—the use of sequences in Advent, which was contrary to the custom of nearly every other Church: the favourite *Alphaism*, by which so many proses not only end each troparia, but nearly every commatist, in *A*; and here and there allusions to the situation or circumstances of the Church of Salisbury; e.g. in a sequence on the Visitation:—

‘ Visitatrix in montanis,
Visitatrix in hīs planis,
Sis matris Ecclesiæ.’

To the total sum of 2,000 known sequences, Sarum would yield about sixty peculiar to itself.

We might dwell on this subject at much greater length, but we will not spend any more time on the one blot of this noble book, though we could not have reconciled it to our conscience to omit all mention of it.

We will now glance at the various short versicles, &c. of the Sarum Missal, and their peculiarities. They are these:—

The *Ad Missam Officium* (Roman Introitus),
with the *Psalm*.

The *Oratio*.

The *Gradale* (Roman Graduale).

The *Offertorium*.

The *Secreta*.

The *Communio*.

The *Post Communio*.

The *Introit* of the Roman, the *Ad Missam Officium* of the Sarum books always agree, with these exceptions. They differ:—

On the 4th Sunday in Advent—where the Roman is *Rorate*

cæli desuper (Isaiah xlv. 8), the English *Memento nostro Domine* (Ps. cvi. 4, 5); Durandus only inserting the latter; but still, his words show that it was not universal: 'Clamat ad eam' (sc. Divinitatem) introitus, dicens *secundum quasdam ecclesias*, 'Memento, &c.' The Southern Missals, generally speaking, agree with Rome: the Northern with us. Sicardus only gives *Memento*.

On Low Sunday, the Sarum Officium is *Resurrexi, et adhuc*, &c. as at Easter, but during the week *Quasimodo*, which the Roman Missal gives to the Sunday also.

With respect to the rest of the responses and anthems in the Sarum book, one thing is to be especially noticed: of all the leading Liturgies of different families, this came, by far, nearest to the Roman. More: this kept nearer to the Gregorian pattern than the Roman itself. And this is true, both of versicles which, when the spiritual sense was no longer understood, were replaced by an easier text; and also of readings which, because of a difficult word, were rejected by Rome; notwithstanding that difficult word, were retained by Salisbury. Let us take an example from the Breviary. Here, in the Epiphany Hymn, *A Patre Unigenitus*, which is A. B. C. Darian, the MSS. Breviaries read—

Quem jam venisse novimus,
Redire item cupimus,
Tu sceptrum tuum inclytum
Tuo defende clypeo.

So the verse came before the earliest Roman, and the earliest Sarum printers. Let us see how each treated it.

'Do Thou,' exclaimed the Roman corrector, 'defend Thy glorious sceptre with Thy shield?—what utter folly! There is something absolutely wrong here. What word will supply the requisite number of syllables?' And so, after a little floundering this way and that, the following was the result:—

Sceptroque tuo inclyto
Tuum defende populum.

'And with Thy glorious sceptre defend Thy people.' True: the *que* has no sense in it: true; *populum* has not a shadow of authority; but, still, the whole taken together yields some degree of sense.

The Sarum editor, on the other hand, retained the MS. reading, evidently without in the least understanding it; but believing that others could explain what he could not. And he was right; with the transposition of one little word—instead of

Tu sceptrum—

he should have given it

Sceptrum tu tuum inclytum
Tuo defende clypeo.

(And this because the line commencing with S must occupy its own place.)

Well, then, are we to understand that God's sceptre is to be defended by His shield? In no wise. But *sceptrum* is, more properly, *septrum*; from *seprio*: that is, *inclytum* *sceptrum* would tell us of the glorious fold of the Church, just as a hymn in the Aberdeen Breviary, on the Feast of S. Ninian reads 'Choris sceptus Angelicis.'

For once, we are about to follow the example of the Puritans, and to draw our 'use' from the subject of our article.

It has been the complaint of Liturgical Scholars, since the revival of Ecclesiological studies, that the English Clergy have been very backward in acquainting themselves with the offices on which their own were founded. It is too true an accusation. None can read the extraordinary 'views,' 'suggestions,' 'theories,' that fill up the '*Correspondence*' of most Church papers, without seeing that the writer was most profoundly and utterly ignorant of the very first principles of Liturgical study: some letters addressed to the *Church Review* are the *ne plus ultra* of this kind of thing. In a Church periodical now extinct, we remember that the study was pursued with more zeal than knowledge. In the *Theologian* appeared an article on the Sarum Liturgy, written by a gentleman who could not read black letter, and in which, among other and even more amusing blunders, occurred *disco operuit*, 'covered with a disk,' for *discooperuit*, 'uncovered.'

Up to the publication of this Missal, it was hard for the clergyman of the Church of England, who was not rich, to study the Sarum Liturgy: for what now can be bought for seven shillings, could only be obtained at the price of three or four pounds.

We can only add, and that in no irreverent spirit, 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' It must be remembered that not only by means of this republication, but also by the recent edition—however far inferior to this, of the Sarum Breviary—and by the reprint and *édition de luxe*, as our French neighbours would call it, of the Aberdeen—and then again, by the reprint and translation of the Primitive Liturgies, the way to these studies has been thrown open to our liturgical students to an extent which, fifty years ago, would have appeared fabulous. Supposing that then, at the commencement of this century, a young Clergyman, entering on a life dedicated to the Church, had been anxious to obtain—in the first place, the ser-

vices of the Primitive Church; next—which most nearly concerned him, the Services, both Liturgical and Choral, of his own Church, as it existed before the Reformation; we may safely affirm that he could not have procured the most necessary materials for this study under fifteen pounds. He may now buy them for as many shillings. This then we do feel most thankfully: that the physical impossibility, so to speak, of purchasing these books, can no longer be pleaded in excuse for the not being acquainted with their contents. Any man may now learn, if he will. And on this account, beyond all others, we desire to thank the editor of the latest edition of the Sarum Missal, for the invaluable gift he has bestowed on the English Communion. We have spoken out boldly where we think he is wrong; therefore we have the more right as boldly to say, that we know of no equal literary gift which has been bestowed on the Church, the chief Office-Book of which has here been re-edited, from the publication of the First Book of Edward VI. till the present time.

ART. VII.—*The Publications of the Surtees Society.* London, Durham, and Edinburgh.

AMONGST the many monuments of learning and literary labour of which our country has to boast, not the least notable are those works which have for their object the illustration of our national history and antiquities. Among our elder historians, Bede, Matthew Paris, and Polydore Vergil, claim the foremost place; Fox and Parker follow them in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth and eighteenth (the great period of historical research in this country) the copious chronicles of Stow, Holingshed, and Hall, were followed by the ponderous folio of Speed, and, amongst other works of extent and importance, by Harpsfield's *Historia Anglicana*, Usher's *Antiquitates*, Sir R. Baker's *Chronicle*, Dugdale's *Monasticon*, Fuller's *Church History*, Alford's *Annales*, Burnet's *Reformation*, Stillingfleet's *Origines*, Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, and the *Histories of Inett, Collier, Strype, and Hume*.

The works of the same class which have been composed since the days of these giants in intellectual stature, are little other than mere compilations from their pages: insomuch that it might have been supposed that their work was completely done; the mine in which they laboured quite exhausted, and no material addition to our knowledge of long past events to be looked for.

Yet is the case far otherwise. It has hitherto been the fate of the historical student to sigh for the many original authorities which were either wholly beyond his reach, or were only to be consulted in some mutilated or otherwise untrustworthy form. Now, however, publications are from time to time issuing from the press which will eventually do very much, nearly all that can be done, to supply this want, introducing us to the original sources and fountain-heads of history; thus superseding all second-hand information, and giving in the end, it cannot be doubted, an entirely new character to historical study. The Camden Society has opened to our view many works illustrative of the history of the country at large, and the society whose name we have placed at the head of our pages is doing a like good office, though on a somewhat smaller scale, and within narrower limits. No man will henceforth be considered in any

wide sense of the word an historian who is not acquainted with the publications issued by these learned bodies; and assuredly no history of our country, whether on Church or State, can in future be written without frequent recourse to their pages. Rather the works in question are themselves, as far as they go, the true history, written as they were by those who were either actual eye-witnesses of the events they chronicle, or who lived so shortly afterwards that the memory of them was still fresh.

The Society, which derives its name from the late Robert Surtees, of Mainsforth, the learned antiquarian, and author of 'The History of the County Palatine of Durham,' was organized with the view of publishing, yearly, works, edited by members of the University of Durham, to illustrate the history, ecclesiastical and civil, of the part of England which formed the ancient kingdom of Northumbria. The chief subjects which have hitherto engaged the attention of these able and laborious scholars are rituals, histories, biographies, biblical translations, works descriptive of the daily lives and acts of the monks of Durham, and ecclesiastical and secular antiquities. Thus amply is redeemed the Society's pledge: 'It has been the endeavour of the Society as far as possible to diversify its publications, and to make them suitable to the tastes of many labourers in the wide field of literary research. The ritualist, the historian, and the genealogist have been equally considered.'

The value of all the works published by the Surtees Society is not perhaps equal; but some of them—such as the Pontificale of Egbert, Archbishop of York—hitherto known only in the brief and sparse extracts of a few writers on ecclesiastical subjects, or the three historians of Durham, Coldingham, Graystones, and Chambre, which were previously to be met with only in the inaccurate and mutilated edition of Wharton—are works at once of deep interest and real value, and as such their publication can be regarded as nothing less than a real national benefit, and our best thanks are due to those painstaking and public-spirited scholars, who have devoted time, labour, and means to this purpose. In the remarks we are about to offer on this very welcome addition to our shelves, we shall confine our notice chiefly to the ecclesiastical works, as being on the whole the most valuable portion of the series.

We must remind our readers that the kingdom of Northumbria was first converted by Paulinus, the companion of S. Augustin. Edwin, the king, had married Ethelburga, the daughter of Ethelbert and Bertha; and he was thus prepared by his wife and her family for the reception of Christianity. The good work accomplished by Paulinus was, however, soon to be undone. In the year 633, the sixth after his baptism,

King Edwin was killed in battle against Penda, King of Mercia. His two successors, Osrick and Eanfride, renounced the new faith; the people followed the example of their sovereigns in abjuring, as they had before done in adopting, Christianity, and compelled Paulinus, with the queen and family of Edwin, to take refuge in Kent. But two years or less subsequently, Osrick and Eanfride being in their turn defeated and slain, Oswald, the son of Edwin's predecessor, and the second founder of Christianity in the north of England, succeeded to the throne, and in a reign of seven years so firmly established the faith, that although subsequently persecuted and oppressed by the invading Danes, it was never wholly subverted. Oswald had spent the time of Edwin's reign, as Bede tells us, in exile 'among the Scots or Picts;' and consequently, when he succeeded that ill-fated monarch, instead of recalling Paulinus, or sending to Rome for missionaries, he applied to the Scots for a bishop, who sent him Gorman, a monk of Iona. But, not proving acceptable to the Northumbrians, Gorman soon returned to his native country, and was succeeded by Aidan, a monk of the same religious house. Pope Gregory had empowered Augustin to consecrate a metropolitan for York; but Oswald disregarded this arrangement, and gave Aidan for his see Lindisfarne, or Holy Island. Aidan soon received the assistance of a number of ordained monks; and in him began that succession of bishops of Holy Island, whose ordinary actions—omitting all mention of the miraculous achievements ascribed to them—approximate ecclesiastical history to romance. The reader of their lives is at a loss whether most to admire their extreme zeal, their apostolic simplicity, their fervent devotion, their profound contempt of wealth and worldly distinction, and their rare single-mindedness; or to wonder at their ignorance of enlarged principles, their semi-barbarism not only of manners but even of mind, and in some points what we must term their selfishness—a selfishness which was mistaken by themselves and their times for pure desire for the glory of God and the advancement of His work. This, both then and subsequently, was a common failing amongst ecclesiastics; yet it is not the less to be deplored and condemned, because it necessarily assumes the appearance of a high virtue. It is of the acts and literary productions of these men and their successors in the Palatinate that we shall chiefly treat.

To take the works of the Society, such of them, that is, as will especially engage our attention, in the order of their publication, would prove embarrassing at once to our readers and to ourselves. We shall prefer to regard rather their chronological order, or their mutual connexion, support, and illustration in

time or subject-matter. And first shall come the works that treat of the life and actions of that pride and wonder of the Anglo-Saxon Church, S. Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne.

There are many histories of this saint extant—Bede has left us two: one in verse and the other in prose, besides a copious account of his acts in his History. To the Surtees Society we are indebted for a prose life; another in Leonine verse published in the '*Miscellanea Biographica*,' and the collection of his miracles by Reginald of Durham. '*The Rites of Durham*,' a work written A.D. 1593, also describes his tomb, his book that fell into the sea when the monks of Lindisfarne were flying from the Danes, the state of his remains in the time of Henry VIII. and other particulars of his relics.

He has been supposed to have descended from the blood-royal of Ireland. This is expressed in the following lines of an Irish biographer, whose curious work is now in the British Museum. It is to be hoped, however, that the poet was better acquainted with the acts of the subject of his muse, than he shows himself to be with the rules of prosody.

'Sanctus Cuthbertus, Anglorum tutor apertus,
Regis erat natus et Hybernicus est generatus.'

Biog. Miscell. p. xi.

S. Cuthbert was successively Prior of Melrose, hostaller of the Monastery of Ripon, Prior of Lindisfarne, and Bishop of Hexam and Lindisfarne. After he had filled the latter see for two years, living in the practice of the most painful and laborious duties of a bishop, an anchorite, and an ascetic, and (if we may credit his historians) in the daily and almost hourly performance of miracles to us alternately astounding and ridiculous, he retired to his hermitage in the island of Farne, and there breathed his last. It was his original intention to be buried where he died; but at the earnest entreaties of those about him, he at length consented to be laid in the church of Lindisfarne. He imposed, however, on the monks the condition that in the event of their ever leaving that island they should take his remains with them. Accordingly they laid him in a stone coffin, on the right of the high altar at Lindisfarne Cathedral. Eleven years afterwards they obtained permission of his successor, Eadbert, to exhume his remains, intending to inclose them in a new coffin, and place them as an object of adoration above the pavement. But finding, as is related by Bede, not only that decay had not set in, but that his body was whole and the joints flexible as in life, they dressed it in new garments, and laid it in a coffin of oak which they placed upon the pavement of the church.

In the year 875, the Danes made a descent on the coast in great numbers; and now came the time to redeem the promise given to the saint at his death. The monks placed his body in a wooden coffin, and inclosed therein certain relics, among which were the skull of King Oswald and some bones of Aidan; and then set out on that course of wanderings which lasted for the space of seven years, and which is well known to the general reader, through Sir Walter Scott.

‘How, when the rude Dane burned their pile,
The monks fled forth from Holy Isle;
O’er northern mountain, marsh and moor,
From sea to sea, from shore to shore,
Seven years Saint Cuthbert’s corpse they bore.
They rested them in fair Melrose;
But though, alive, he loved it well,
Not there his reliques might repose;
For, wondrous tale to tell!
In his stone-coffin forth he rides,
(A ponderous bark for river tides)
Yet light as gossamer it glides
Downward to Tilmouth cell.
Nor long was his abiding there,
For southward did the saint repair;
Chester-le-Street and Rippon saw
His holy corpse, ere Wardilaw
Hail’d him with joy and fear;
And, after many wanderings past
He chose his lordly seat at last
Where his cathedral, huge and vast,
Looks down upon the Wear.
There, deep in Durham’s Gothic shade,
His reliques are in secret laid;
But none may know the place,
Save of his holiest servants three
Deep sworn to solemn secrecy
Who share that wondrous grace.’

Marmion, Canto ii. stanz. xiii.

His servants three must have forgotten their oath, as his dwelling-place has long been well known; but fortunately for their credit, the tradition rests on no basis of truth.

One of the earliest ideas of his bearers was to leave England entirely, and pass over to Ireland. With this view the Bishop Eardulph and a few more embarked on the Derwent, but were soon met by a violent storm which compelled them again to seek the land. It is recorded that in their haste and danger, one of their most valuable possessions, an elaborate and beautiful copy of the Gospels, written by Eadfrid, afterwards Bishop of Lindisfarne, for the use of S. Cuthbert, was washed overboard, and its loss formed one great inducement to them to return to land. The book, strange to say, was afterwards

discovered drifted on shore as far north and west as Withern, in Galloway. The place of its deposit is said to have been made known to the monks by S. Cuthbert himself, who appeared for that purpose to one of them in a dream. And as everything connected with S. Cuthbert must needs partake more or less of the miraculous, we learn from the historian Simeon, and from the compiler of the '*Rites of Durham*,' 'that this holy booke 'was far more beautiful and glorious to looke uppon both 'within and without than it was before, being nothing blemished 'with the salt water, but polished by some heavenly hand; which 'did not a little increase their joye.'¹

The book was subsequently conveyed to Durham, where Bishop Carileph (A.D. 1080—1099) placed it on the great altar 'as a fitt monument to preserve the memory of so great a 'saint.'²

When the above authors said that it was improved and beautified by its submersion, they had little idea that there would ever exist such an institution as the British Museum, or that this book would in subsequent times find a place in it, and thus afford a means of testing the truth of their assertion. Unfortunately for their veracity, the volume, which is actually in that repertory, bears evident traces of the damaging effects of the sea-water.

From the west coast the band of wanderers travelled to Craike, in Yorkshire, thence to Chester-le-Street, to Ripon, and lastly to Durham. It is related that soon after their arrival at Chester-le-Street, S. Cuthbert appeared to Eadred the abbot in a dream, and bid him tell King Alfred to give him all the land between the Wear and the Tyne, and to make his church a place of refuge for criminals of whatever kind for thirty-seven days. This was accordingly done, and thus the territory of S. Cuthbert was converted into a county palatine, and its bishops were made temporal princes. From Ripon it was the intention of S. Cuthbert's bearers to remove him either back to Chester-le-Street, or to his original resting-place in Lindisfarne, but they were prohibited from so doing by another miracle. When they came into the neighbourhood of Durham, the carriage on which the coffin was placed, suddenly became so firmly fixed to the ground as to defy the efforts of the whole band to move it. After three days spent in acts of extraordinary devotion, the saint was pleased to reveal to Eadmer, one of the monks, his intention to have his final rest nowhere but at Dunholme. But 'being distressed,' says the old historian, 'because they were 'ignorant where Dunholme was, see their good fortune, as they

¹ *Rites of Durham*, p. 60.

² *Ibid.* p. 53.

‘were goinge, a woman that lacked her cow did call aloud to her companion to know if shee did see her, who answered with a loud voice that her cow was at Dunholme, a happy and heavenly eccho to the distressed monkes, who by that meanes were at the end of their journey, where they should find a restinge place for the body of their honoured saint. And thereuppon, with great joy and gladnesse brought his body to Dunholme, Anno Domini 999, which was inculca tellus, a barbarous and rude place, replenished with nothing but thornes and thick woods, save only in the midst where the church now standeth, which was plaine and commodious for such a purpose.’ (*Rites of Durham*, p. 61.) ‘And because,’ the author continues, ‘those holy bishops and monkes would not be unmindful of the least favour which was done for them, and the honour of their holy saint; Aldinus, on the outside of his church, and Ranulph Flamberd, accordinge to the intention of William Carlipho, the founder, did erect a monument, of a MILKE-MAIDE MILKING HER KOUe, on the outside of the north-west turrett of the nine altars, at the buildinge of the new church, in a thankful remembrance of that maide which so fortunately in their great perplexity directed them to Dunholme, where the body of their great saint was to rest untill the resurrection, which monument, though defaced by the weather, to this day is there to be seen.’ (P. 63.)

An ancient sculpture of two women and a cow was, in fact, in existence at the beginning of the present century on the eastern transept; but it has since been replaced by a modern substitute. After three several buildings had been erected, in which to deposit the remains of the saint, Bishop Carileph, in the beginning of the eleventh century, laid the foundation of the present cathedral, and in the Episcopate of Flambard, his successor, Cuthbert’s remains were removed to the spot which they occupied till the Reformation, and over which they are still deposited.

Soon after (A.D. 1022) a miracle, as Reginald calls it, or, as it would more probably be termed in these days, a systematic fraud, was openly and habitually performed by a relic-hunter of the name of Elfrid Westone. Under pretence of great reverence for S. Cuthbert, he was accustomed to open his coffin, and comb and cut what he called his hair, which he would publicly expose to the action of fire: the opinion of the bystanders of the merits of the saint being, of course, much increased when it was seen to shine in the flames like gold without suffering injury or diminution.

The conjecture of Dr. Raine, the learned historian of North Durham, that this pretended hair was nothing else than a portion

of gold wire which Reginald states to have been bound round the skull, and the impress of which remained distinctly visible thereon when the coffin was opened in the year 1827, seems as probable as it is simple and obvious. Be this as it may, the hair of S. Cuthbert was not the first to which the reputation of incorruptibility had been attached. The '*Biographia Miscellanea*' contains, among other things, a life of Oswin, an early king of Deira, who was treacherously put to death by Oswy, the usurper of his crown. The author appears to have been a monk of S. Albans, who had removed to Tynemouth, a dependent cell of the monastery of the proto-martyr; and he informs us, that 414 years after the death of Oswin, in the time of Tosti the brother of Harold, the body of the murdered sovereign was discovered and exhumed. The hair was found undecayed, and Judith, the wife of Tosti, to confirm the people's faith in the sanctity of Oswin, publicly tested it by fire, and found that it was unconsumable.¹

But in the year 1072, a deception more flagrant in itself, and which might have proved of more important consequences, was practised by the clergy of Durham to preserve undetected the false fame of the incorruptibility of the remains of S. Cuthbert. William the Conqueror heard the report of the incorruptible body that was at Durham; and wishing to ascertain its truth, resolved to have the coffin opened, and the contents inspected by two of his chaplains. The feast of All Saints was the day appointed for the exhumation, and the service was commenced, when the king was suddenly seized by a violent fever, under the influence of which he rushed from the church, mounted his horse, and rode without stopping until he had crossed the Tees. It seems clear that the clergy knew that the proposed inspection must instantly prove the falsehood of the pretended miracle, and as William had threatened them with death, if they were discovered to be guilty of a fraud, the idea of Dr. Raine, that they had practised on him, as the unknown monk is said to have done on his descendant John, to produce his illness, seems but too probable. The degradation of these unworthy priests was, however, at hand. In the year 1083, Bishop Carileph expelled the secular clergy for their sloth and evil habits, and instituted in their place a prior and monks of the order of S. Benedict, from the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow.

Twenty-one years afterwards, on the 29th of August, the coffin was opened, and the body inspected by the prior and a few of the brethren of the monastery, previously to its removal

¹ *Biog. Miscell.* p. 14.

to its final resting-place behind the high altar of the new cathedral. Reginald has minutely described the appearance of the coffin, the body, the robes in which it was enveloped, and, in a word, every particular connected with it. The body was wrapped in the winding-sheet given to the saint during his life by the Abbess Vecca, over which was the alb, stole, and fanon; an amice was on the neck and shoulders, above them a purple dalmatic and tunic; then robes of silk, and lastly, the episcopal sandals were on his feet. The coffins were three in number. The innermost was that in which he had been placed in Lindisfarne: it was covered with most elaborate carvings of flowers, beasts, and other objects, and the lid was raised by two iron rings, one at the head, and another at the feet. It is significant that the head and face were covered by a cloth which could not be raised, and which merely allowed a view of the eyelids and part of the nose; but there was a purple face-cloth, which, when raised, gave sight of the person between the joints of the neck and shoulders. On the forehead was a fillet of gold studded with gems. In the coffin lay the scissors and comb already mentioned as having been used by Westone: a small silver altar, a cloth for covering the sacramental elements, and a golden paten. The head of Oswald, and some other relics, reposed by his side. The body was found to be so flexible, that three persons were required to lift it out of the coffin, one at each extremity, and one in the middle.

But a certain abbot not being quite satisfied as to the truth of the incorruptibility of the body, it was agreed, after some discussion, to give him ocular proof of the fact, which was done in the following manner. The body was brought into the choir, where the coffin was opened, and another person, the Abbot of Seez, who had espoused the part of the prior and his monks, was commissioned to handle the remains: no one else being allowed by the prior to touch them, or anything belonging to them. This was, of course, decisive; the wonder of the devout believers was satisfied, and the doubts of the sceptical were silenced, if not removed. The revered remains with the head of S. Oswald were now again consigned to the coffin, which, as Reginald signifies, was raised on nine stone pillars, and placed behind the high altar, where it was allowed to remain undisturbed and in peace to the time of Henry VIII. In the year 1540-41, three commissioners, as we learn from the Rites, 'Dr. Ley (or Lee), Dr. Henley, and Maister Blythman,' held a visitation at Durham, 'for the subverting of monuments, . . . where they found many worthy and precious jewels, but especially one precious stone, which, by the estimate of those three visitors and their skilful lapidaries, was of value sufficient

‘to redeem a prince. After the spoil of his ornaments and jewels, coming nearer to his body, thinking to have found nothing but dust and bones, and finding the chest that he did lie in very strongly bound with iron, then the goldsmith did take a great fore-hammer of a smith, and did break the said chest; and when they had opened the chest, they found him lying whole, uncorrupt, with his face bare, and his beard as it had been a fortnight’s growth, and all his vestments upon him, as he was accustomed to say mass withal, and his mete-wand of gold lying beside him.’¹

The account states further, that the goldsmith, on opening the coffin, broke one of his legs, an accident which seems to have led to a closer examination of the body, the result being, that not only was it found to be ‘whole and uncorrupted, but the vestments wherein his body lay, and wherewithal he was accustomed to say mass, were safe, fresh, and not consumed. Whereupon the visitors commanded that he should be carried into the vestry, where he was close and safely kept in the inner part of the revestre till such time as they did know the king’s pleasure what to do with him; and upon notice of the king’s pleasure therein, the prior and the monks buried him in the ground under the same place where his shrine was exalted.’ (Pp. 85, 86.)

These assertions have been tested within our own times. In the year 1827, the tomb was again opened, and its contents a fourth time inspected. A full account is given by Dr. Raine, who was one of those engaged in the work. Everything was found precisely as Reginald had described it. There were three coffins, all very much decayed. The innermost, that in which the remains had originally been deposited at Lindisfarne in the year 698, contained among other things, the skull, real or pretended, of King Oswald; an iron ring, one of the two, doubtless, which had been used for the purpose of raising the lid, the ivory comb, the small silver altar, and the linen bag to contain the sacramental elements. This coffin was found to be covered with carved work precisely as described by Reginald. But whilst this examination established the veracity of that historian, it completely disproved the tradition of the incorruptibility of the saint’s remains. Not only was nothing but bones found, but the condition of the coffin in which they lay showed clearly no decay of flesh, or exuding of blood or other fluid had taken place since the remains were first deposited in it. Dr. Raine suggests that the body had been swathed in clothes to resemble in bulk and pliability a living form; and what is most remark-

¹ Rites, p. 85.

able, the eyeholes of the skull were ascertained to have been filled by a white paste, no doubt to give to the face-cloth, as the above able antiquary supposes, the projecting appearance of eyes; a fact which alone would tend to prove that deceit had been practised at some time, most probably in the year 1104.

The miraculous power of S. Cuthbert was by no means confined to the merely passive achievement of preserving his remains from decay. The battle of Neville's Cross showed him in the higher light of the national champion and protector. David, King of Scotland, taking advantage of the absence of Edward III. in France, invaded the north of England with an army of 50,000 men, and advanced as far as the gates of Durham. The regular army of England was with Edward, and there was little to oppose the enemy but scanty levies hastily raised and very imperfectly disciplined. In these critical circumstances, John Fossom, Prior of Durham, was commanded by the saint, in a vision on the night before the battle, to put the corporax cloth which Cuthbert had used to cover the elements at mass on a spear, and repair with it to the field of battle. He did so; and such was the sanctity of the holy relic, that it overcame the virtue even of the miraculous Black Rood of Scotland, and insured the victory to the English. A saint who could so effectually protect the nation was, of course, the most fit person to be made guardian of cities and churches, and S. Cuthbert was accordingly the patron saint of Lindisfarne, Hexam, Chester-le-Street, Durham, and several other places; and his figure, with the head of King Oswald in the left hand, formed the seal of several of the bishops of the see. Bishop Kirkham even went so far as to invoke him as giver of grace and salvation, in a Latin line couched in terms which could rightly be addressed to the Creator alone:

‘ Presul Cuthberte regnem super æthera per te :’

and William Stiphel, Sub-Prior of Durham, has left an illumination in which he is represented in the attitude of supplication before S. Cuthbert, to whom he is addressing a prayer not less offensive:

‘ Confessor vere Cuthberte mei miserere.’

The work which gives us these, contains many other like rhymes, but we gladly spare our readers the pain of perusing them. It cannot be wondered at, that as soon as a sound knowledge began to be diffused through the country, the system which allowed so grave an offence against the primary truth of Revelation should at once have been swept away. The virtues and graces of the saints should have been the examples of their

successors; but they were made by the mere perverseness of the latter to be the means of obscuring the truth; so that it was scarcely possible to avoid applying to them the emphatic words of the Psalmist, 'The things that should have been for their wealth, are made unto them an occasion of falling.'

The miracles, so called, that have been ascribed to S. Cuthbert are almost without number. To give even a bare enumeration of them would be impossible; but some related by Reginald are so grotesque that we cannot forbear offering one or two as a specimen of the rest. There are, on the island of Farne, a race of ducks called eider or S. Cuthbert's ducks, which the saint took under his especial protection, appropriating to them a spot on the island on which to build their nests, and appointing them their seasons of arrival and departure. The progeny shared the privileges of the parents. For after S. Cuthbert's death, an eremite, by name Ælric, made his habitation on the island, accompanied by his servant Leving. Ælric was called away by some emergency, but he left his servant behind him. The man, feeling a strong inclination to try the savouriness of one of the ducks, forthwith selected and killed the best and fattest he could find. To prevent his sin against the saint being found out, he scattered the bones and feathers up and down the shore. A fortnight after, his master returned; and lo, in the church of S. Cuthbert, below the host, collected together in a mass, lay the feathers, beak, bones, and claws, of the slaughtered bird. He examined Leving as to whether any stranger had visited the island, and being assured that no one had touched the shore since his departure, he at once taxed the luckless culprit with the double sin of having broken the command of S. Cuthbert and eaten a duck! The man at first denied it, but being shown the remains, he fell conscience-stricken at his master's feet, and made a full confession of his crime; expressing his wonder how the parts which he had taken so much pains to scatter had been collected together, and why, after so long a time, the sea had given them up unconsumed. But the sea, exclaims the author, presumed not to swallow the remains of the saint's bird, the flesh of which this sinner had scrupled not to devour! It cannot be doubted, he adds, that it was S. Cuthbert's powerful hand which had collected the fragments and cast them into his church, at once to discover the presumption of the culprit and to reveal his wickedness. The hermit gave S. Cuthbert his acknowledgments, and to satisfy him, visited the shoulders of his servant with a good flagellation, and condemned him to pass many days in abstinence and repentance. Reginald appeals for the truth of this miracle to Leving, who

was still alive when he penned his work, and who had often described the fact to himself and others. Ælric also during his life had been accustomed to talk of it.¹ It did not occur to them that on so bare a spot as Farne, the gusts and eddies of wind may have had a good deal to do with the matter, sweeping together the heavier portions of the bird, and depositing them (as one sees masses of sea-weed deposited at the foot of a rock) in some sheltered place where they could drift no further.

Again, the bearers of S. Cuthbert's body had been pursuing their heavy occupation for a long period, and had got very weary of it, and began to complain to each other of the length of the way and the burthen of their task. One after another of the band dropped off, until four only were left. To one of these S. Cuthbert appeared in a vision, and bade him tell his companions to go on the morrow each of them into a wood, and appropriate whatever they should find there to the work of carrying his remains. They went, and found among them a bit, a horse, a bridle, and a carriage loaded with every kind of necessary for their journey. They placed the body on the carriage, and so carried it about without fatigue to themselves. But a more astounding proof of S. Cuthbert's power was to happen. There was a famine in the land caused by the ravages of the Dane; and our wanderers had nothing to eat but salt horse's head and cheese. One of the number, unable to endure the pangs of famine, stole some of the cheese. The others fell to imploring the aid of S. Cuthbert, and begged that the thief might be turned into a fox. Now came the wonder. As they sat at their frugal meal, with the ground for their table, they suddenly beheld a fox running about S. Cuthbert's coffin with some new cheese in his mouth. Although it was judged becoming by them to offer this prayer, it seems that the last thing they dreamt of was, that the saint would take them at their word; and in consequence they were filled with amazement at what they saw, and wondered what could be the meaning of so novel and wonderful a portent. At first they thought that none of their number were missing, but it turned out that one, by name Eilaf, was nowhere to be seen. Meanwhile, the fox kept running round and round the coffin with its mouth open, but the cheese held in some wonderful manner in its jaws, and by the grotesqueness of its movements greatly exciting their mirth; it being unable either to swallow the cheese or to conceal it, whilst its new form ('vellus insoliti corporis') prevented the possibility of its escaping notice. At length the bearers put it to one another that the thief had been

¹ Reginald, chap. xxvii. pp. 60-63.

sufficiently punished, the power of S. Cuthbert proved, and their own waning faith confirmed, and that they ought all to unite in praying the saint to restore the culprit to his proper shape. S. Cuthbert gave a gracious ear to their petitions, and Eilaf again stood before them a man; a proof at once of the saint's anger against sinners, and of his clemency towards his faithful bedesmen. But something was required to perpetuate the memory at once of so great a crime and so wonderful an act of power; and consequently the name of Tod or Fox was given to the poor culprit; and, says Reginald, it has stuck to his descendants to this very day.¹

On one occasion, S. Cuthbert, proved by the unanswerable test of a candle dedicated to him burning out the first, that his merits and power were greater than those of his rivals King Edmund the Martyr, and Queen Eldritha. On another, the crew of a fishing smack were employing themselves as they sailed with fishing, when suddenly a violent storm arose; their mast went by the board; their steering tackle was lost; their oars were broken or rendered useless: the crew were nearly dead with fear—all hope of life seemed gone, and they spoke only to implore the aid of S. Cuthbert. But lo! the saint himself suddenly, as in a bodily form, visibly and palpably appeared before them, and took on himself the office of their pilot. He was arrayed in his pontifical garments, with his mitre on his head. His appearance was that of beauty, such as eye had never before beheld. With his pontifical staff, as with a rudder, he divided the raging waters, and caused the ship to scud on the top of the waves, so that they had no power over her to injure or turn her from her course. S. Cuthbert bade them be of good cheer, and promised not to leave them until he had brought them safe to shore. They soon after landed on Lindisfarne, S. Cuthbert driving the ship high and dry on the sands, so that the crew in disembarking did not even wet their shoes. He then caused them to disembark all their lading, tackle, nets, and fish, and to secure the battered hull by cables, that the waves might not carry it out to sea. This done, he simply said, '*Consummatum est*,' and, vanishing from their sight, returned again to his place of rest and beatitude. The sailors told all that had happened to Bartholomew, a monk of Durham, who was leading the life of a hermit on the island, and from whose relation to John the Monk, Reginald affirms himself to have received the story. He does not fail, in conclusion, to compare this miracle of S. Cuthbert to that of our Lord, when He came to His disciples as they were toiling in rowing, and brought them at once to land (S. John vi. 21). We

¹ Reginald, chap. xv.

cannot help noticing the fact that, with an error hardly to the credit of a divine and a historian, he strangely supposes this event to have happened after the Resurrection.

So much for Reginald of Durham. Bede, in his life of S. Cuthbert, has many stories even more wonderful. He relates how one morning, when S. Cuthbert had come out of the sea, where it was his custom to spend the night in prayer up to the neck in water, two otters followed him on shore, and lay down before him, and wiped his feet with their hair; after which, he gave them his blessing, and they returned to their native element (chap. x.). Again, as he was travelling on an evangelical mission, he and a boy, his attendant, having no provisions of their own, were miraculously fed by an eagle, which caught a fish just as they were passing, and brought it to land for their express benefit (chap. xii.).

Soon after is recorded a marvel which must surely have been in the mind of the witty and facetious author of the 'Ingoldsby Legends' when he wrote his inimitable 'Jackdaw of Rheims.' S. Cuthbert had built some huts for the use of the brethren of his monastery, and he one day saw two crows, which had been accustomed to build on the island, pulling out the thatch for their nests. He stretched out his hand, and warned them to do no harm to the brethren. Seeing that they paid no attention to his words, he adjured them in the Name of our Lord immediately to leave the place and return no more. On this, they at once fled sorrowfully away. Three days after, as S. Cuthbert was digging, one of them returned, and with outspread wings, head bent down to the saint's feet, and humble voice, asked pardon for what it had done by the most expressive signs it could make. Its prayer was granted, and S. Cuthbert also gave it leave to return to the island. The culprits hereupon exhibited an anxiety to atone for their misdeeds, which surpassed that even of the Bird of Rheims itself. Not contented with simply expressing penitence, and resolved to make more ample amends than the mere restitution of the stolen thatch would have been, they fled back to the saint with a large piece of hog's lard. S. Cuthbert accepted their tribute, and kept the lard for greasing the brethren's shoes; and he used, whenever he produced it, to bid them imitate the example of the givers, who, when they had done what was wrong, hastened by prayers, lamentations, and gifts to wash away their offence. The crows remained many years on the island, a pattern to all men of reformation; and they never attempted from that day forth to do mischief to any one! (chap. xx.)

The supernatural stories related by Bede of S. Cuthbert resemble in one respect those contained in the Ecclesiastical and

Religious History of Theodoret. Both sets of miracles are wholly incredible in themselves ; yet their respective narrators declare them to be true, either on personal knowledge or on the assurance of those who saw them done, or who had other infallible means of knowing their truth. Many of these wonderful achievements can of course be immediately explained by the laws of nature ; but there are still many to which this solution cannot apply ; and what are we to say of these ? Were their authors the mere victims of excessive and blind credulity, or were they wilfully deceiving ? One or other of these conclusions appears to be inevitable, and yet there are grave objections to both. The question is one, in fact, on which much has been written ; but a satisfactory answer seems as far off as ever. We think that none can be given ; consequently, all we can do is to leave the matter where we find it. And, when we consider that even in these days, when so much more is known of the phenomena of Nature, we still meet with persons, sensible and well informed in other respects, who are ready to believe almost anything partaking of the marvellous and supernatural, it does not seem so astonishing that in times when so little was known, people, whose minds were full of one subject, and who were necessarily the victims in so great a degree of their own senses, should have thought much that was really very ordinary and matter of course to be beyond the laws of Nature. It shows perhaps that they who so concluded were beginning to observe more closely the arcana of Nature. The wonder rather is, that the historians of such stories—Reginald and others—did not use their reason a little, the slightest exercise of which would at once have sufficed, as in the monk turned into a fox, to explain the whole mystery. At the same time, we confess that there are still some miracles, such as that of S. Cuthbert bringing the ship into port, which do not admit of such explanation. But we must remember that this, like other similar stories, rests on the testimony of those who had an interest in inventing such reports, and who are the prototypes of our modern seafaring men, whose superstitions and wonderful stories of supernatural events, devoutly believed in by them, are well known to all who have the least acquaintance with their class. Yet, excuse and explain it as we may, the belief in these stories in the ages when they were written by Bede and Reginald is, as the editor of Reginald justly remarks, 'a fact humiliating enough to human reason.'

But we should greatly err, and do our subject much injustice, if we took our idea of S. Cuthbert wholly from this farrago of profane nonsense. Bede, when ceasing to speak of him as a worker of miracles, and telling us what he was as a prior and bishop, gives us a glimpse of better things. He describes him

as really doing the work of an evangelist, and labouring to convert the people from witchcraft, idolatry, and vice; and says, it was his custom to go either on horseback or on foot, but more frequently the latter, to the towns in the neighbourhood of his monastery, and preach to and teach the people. For this purpose, he frequently preferred the villages that were seated on the mountains, the poverty and barbarity of which caused them to be deserted by other missionaries. He would often spend weeks at a time teaching the people at once by his precept and example. He further describes him as a man of rare zeal and devotion; fervid in correcting sinners, but gentle and mild to the penitent.¹ And if, among his personal habits, we find it boasted, as a proof of his renunciation of self and of his almost superhuman virtue, that (among other like actions) he would frequently keep his shoes on from one Easter to another, and only then removed them because of the washing of the feet that preceded the celebration of the Lord's Supper, we must remember the light in which such conduct appeared to the men of his own age and long subsequent ones; who, so far from ascribing to cleanliness the place allotted to it in our modern proverb, considered even a moderate attention to its dictates as betokening a mind given up to luxury, and intent only on the pleasant things of life. But S. Cuthbert was, upon the whole, in advance of his time in this respect. Bartholomew the hermit, who lived on the island after S. Cuthbert, carried his dislike of water to a far greater extent than did that saint. Bede tells us, that S. Cuthbert used to wear ordinary garments, and was remarkable neither for their too great neatness, nor for their want of cleanliness. In his convent the monks followed his example, and only made it their custom not to have their clothing of any varied or precious colour.²

S. Cuthbert's reputation, however, thus prepared and bolstered up with wonders and miracles, far surpassed that of men who were better than himself; at least, who did much greater service to the Church and the kingdom in their day; such as Bede, S. John of Beverley, and others. We will borrow a passage from Dr. Raine's '*North Durham*,' which, to our mind, accounts for this fact:

'Such was the credulity of the period which set in soon after the death of Cuthbert, that a saint had become necessary for the welfare of the church of Lindisfarne, and Cuthbert was the only one of its Bishops who could be pitched upon with any degree of propriety. Aidan, its first Bishop, had held erroneous notions with respect to the observance of Easter. Finan was still more heterodox, and Colman so far defended the customs of his predecessors as to

¹ Eccles. Hist. book iv. chap. 27.

² Bede's Life of S. Cuthbert, p. 16.

resign his charge, from the most conscientious motives. Tuda, the next Bishop, died before he had an opportunity of enriching a future legend, and any miracle which might have been performed by Eata, his successor, would have been equally claimed by the see of Hexham. Cuthbert, therefore, was the first Bishop of Lindisfarne of whom a patron saint could be fairly made. Upon the important points of Easter and ecclesiastical tonsure he was orthodox, and besides, what I verily believe to be the case, he was eminently remarkable for his simplicity of manners and his judicious deportment.—P. 62.

Whatever graces of mind or disposition S. Cuthbert may have possessed, it is certain that to those of the person he could have laid little or no claim. There is a description of him, in which he is said to have had a long face, and to have been of a variedly ruddy complexion (*faciē aliquantulum producta interfuse subrubicundus*), with the hair of his head and beard rather thin, and sprinkled with grey: but as this only depends on the testimony of a poor insane youth, to whom he appeared in a vision 600 years after his death, and is in part opposed to the evidence of his remains, the skull showing that his face must have been a short one, we would rather not lay much stress on it.¹ Reginald tells us, he was tall and of manly stature, but with a sharply turned-up nose, and a furrow in his chin, so deep as almost to contain a man's finger. The examination of his remains by Dr. Raine enables us to add, that he had a flat, narrow forehead and parietal bones, protuberant occipital bones, a short face, eyes deeply set in the head, high cheek-bones, a remarkably protuberant upper jaw, and a large and projecting front tooth. We must leave to phrenologists to decide from these data as to what were the saint's moral and intellectual powers and endowments: if we do not mistake, they would say that he had probably a considerable capacity for concentrating his powers on one object, but, judging from the flat parietal bones, no very strong natural bias towards religion, and none of the higher intellectual gifts; but that his most distinguished characteristics were, a good deal of caution, prudence, and what is termed longheadedness. And, as if to confirm this view, it is certain we have no mention of any works of his, theological or other, such as those of Bede, in the same century; and in his evangelical labours, with a people as ignorant as those among whom he visited, a very little learning would go a great way, and enable him, with the example of a life which there is no doubt was one of remarkable holiness, to produce great results in his own day, and to leave a high reputation behind him.

The 'Rites of Durham' gives us an interesting account of some portions of the daily life and customs of the monks of

¹ Reginald of Durham, chap. exiv.

Durham. The prior, or lord prior, as he was more properly called, was the head of the house, whose name and office at the suppression of the monasteries were merged into those of the dean; Hugh Whitehead having been the last prior and the first dean. It was his duty to see that hospitality was preserved in the convent; and we read, that the prior 'did keep 'a most honourable house and very noble intertaynment, being 'attended upon both with gentlemen and yeomen of the best 'of the countrie, as the honourable service of his house deserved 'no lesse; the benevolence thereof, with the releef and almesse 'of the hole convent was alwaies oppen and free, not onlie to 'the poore of the cite of Durham, but to all the poore people 'of the countrie besides.' In accordance with this character, a number of poor children, called children of the almry, were taught in the fermory school, which was founded and maintained by the priors, and were fed from the table of the novices. Four aged women were also lodged in the fermory without the south gates, supported by the prior, and fed from his own table. In addition to the above school, there was one for the express purpose of teaching six children to sing. They were fed with the children of the almry school at the cost of the house. The master was lodged near the school, and batted (as we should say) in the prior's hall, with the prior's gentlemen, but in all other respects he was supported jointly by the prior and convent. It was his duty to play the organ at high mass, and at even-song. This school was continued till the suppression of the monastery, when it was abandoned, and the building, falling into decay, was pulled down. For more notable and extensive entertainments, the convent possessed 'a famous house of hospitallitie,' called the guests' hall, furnished with chambers for the reception of strangers, of whatever rank or degree. Their provisions were supplied from the prior's kitchen, and were in quality according to the quality of the guests; and yearly, on Maunday Thursday, the prior washed and kissed the feet of thirteen poor men, and gave each of them thirty pence in money, and seven herrings, serving them himself with drink and three loaves of bread, and 'certaine wafers': the monks performed the same service at the same time to 'certaine' (probably the same number of) children. 'The godly ceremony thus endyd, after certaine praiers said by 'the prior and the whole convent, they did all depart in great 'holiness.'

The chief officer under the prior was the sub-prior, who had control of all the monks and novices. He always dined and supped with the monks, saying grace, and presiding at the high end of the table. He visited the dortor, or dormitory, every

night about midnight, and knocked at the chamber-door of each of the monks, and called on the inmates by name, to ascertain that all were in their rooms and quiet. His own room was the first in the dortor, so situated that he might see to the preservation of order among the brethren. The doors of the frater-house, cellar and cloisters, were locked every evening at five o'clock, and the keys were taken to the sub-prior till seven the next morning, when he caused the doors to be opened, and delivered the keys of the cloister to the porter, and those of the frater-house and cellar to the yeoman of the cellar.

The monks and novices slept each in his own chamber, which was wainscoted, and partitioned off from the dortor, or dormitory. This is described as a faire large house, 'all paved with fyne tyled stone from one end to the other.' The windows of these chambers looked towards the cloister eastward, and towards the infirmary westward, and in each stood a desk for their books. At each end of the dortor were twelve cressets of stone, which were kept burning all night, to light the monks and novices when they rose for the midnight lauds and matins, and other purposes. It was the duty of the cook to see that these cressets were properly supplied with grease. The chambers of the novices were less comfortable than those of the monks. They had merely such light as penetrated from the 'foreside,' being close both above and on either side.

The frater-house was a large hall, finely wainscoted on the north, south, and west sides. At eleven o'clock, the bell rang to summon them to wash at the laver, or conduit, after which, they proceeded to the 'loft,' which was in the west end of the frater-house, where they dined. In another loft over the frater-house, as appears, the elder monks dined, and the whole convent, with the sub-prior, supped. After dinner, the younger monks were accustomed to resort to the sanctory garth, or burial-place of the convent, each standing bare-headed for a certain long space, and praying for the souls of those who lay beneath. Their devotions ended, they went back to their studies until evening at three o'clock. The older monks, however, and the novices were exempt from this discipline. At five o'clock, the supper of the convent, at which the sub-prior again presided, was concluded, when the monks went to the chapter-house, where, with the prior, they remained in devotion till six; at which time, upon the ringing of a bell, they went to the Salvi.

As in our colleges, there was attached to the convent a common room, in which, in winter, a fire was kept burning, for the benefit of the monks; the master and officers of the house

alone being allowed fires in their own rooms. In this room was held, between Martinmas and Christmas, the festival of O Sapientia: a solemn banquet of 'figs, reysings, aile and 'kakes, kept with no superfluitie or excesse, but a scholastical 'and moderate congratulacion amonges themselves.' Near this room was an underground one of a very different nature, and dedicated to a very different purpose—the 'stronge prysone, 'called the lyinge-house, in which great offenders among the 'monks, *e. g.* those taken in felony or adultery, were confined 'in chaines, and deprived for a year of all society, but that of 'the master of the fermory, who let down their meat through 'a trap-door with a cord.' The lay members of the house offending in the same manner were delivered over to the secular power.

When a monk was taken ill he was removed from his own chamber in the dortor to one in the infirmary, 'where he might have both fire and more convenient keeping.' If he seemed not likely to recover, the prior's chaplain was sent for who staid with him till he died. The barber then attended, who put on him his socks and boots, and wound him in his cowle and habit. He was then conveyed to the dead men's chamber in the fermery and kept till night, when he was removed to S. Andrew's chapel, adjoining the dead chamber, till eight o'clock the following morning. The night before the funeral, two monks, friends or kindred of the deceased, were appointed by the prior as special mourners, 'sytyinge all night on their knees at the dead corses feet,' the children of the aumery sitting on their knees in stalls on either side the corpse, read the Psalter throughout the night till the above hour in the morning, when the corpse was conveyed to the chapter, where it was met by the prior and the whole convent, who said the 'dirige' and offered prayers for his soul. After this the corpse was conveyed through the 'parler,' 'a place for merchants to utter their wares,' to the sanctuarie garth, where it was buried: a chalice of wax was laid on the breast, and the blue bed which had served the deceased during his lifetime being held over the grave by four monks, and afterwards given to the sexton as his perquisite for digging the grave, the whole was concluded by the ringing over the grave of a single peal. The same observances held good in the funeral of the priors, except that the chalice placed on their breasts might be of silver or other metal, and that they lay each under a marble stone. From the middle of the fourteenth century the priors were, with one exception, buried in the cathedral.

The novices were always six in number, and they were in statu pupillari for seven years; their master and instructor

being one of the oldest monks, 'that was lernede.' They had no wages for the first year, during which time it was their master's duty to see that they were properly provided with clothes and bedding. If any showed himself possessed of superior talents or industry he was sent to Oxford to study divinity; the rest being kept in the convent until they could understand their service and the Scriptures. At the end of the first year they were allowed to sing mass, and were furnished with the same yearly payment as the other monks who were not officers of the house, viz. 20s. a year, out of which sum they found themselves their apparel. They dined and supped in the frater-house with their master, at which time one of them, by his appointment, was accustomed to read from a high desk at the south end of the high table a chapter of the Old or New Testament from the Vulgate; which done, the master gave notice, by tolling of a 'gilden bell' that hung over his head, to one of the novices to say grace, 'and so after grace said they separated to their books.' A fair portion of time seems to have been dedicated to their studies. Both forenoon and afternoon of every day were given up to them, and the only recreation of which mention is made is, that a garden and bowling-alley belonged to the common room, in which the novices had occasionally permission to recreate themselves, the master always being present to keep order among them.

Next to the prior and sub-prior, the chief officers of the convent were as follows:—the master of the feretory, or keeper of S. Cuthbert's shrine. It was his duty to show the shrine to any person of note who desired to see it, and to receive their offerings, whether gold, silver, jewels, unicorn, elephant tooth, and the like. He had also the exhibition of S. Cuthbert's corporax cloth already mentioned, and his banner, which, like the corporax cloth, was considered a relic of singular virtue; as the former had overcome the Scottish black rood at the battle of Neville's Cross, so the latter brought home the King of Scotland's banner that was taken at Flodden. The same officer had also the supervision of the shrine of Bede, which, with S. Cuthbert's banner, was borne in solemn procession on the greater festivals.

The terrar had charge of the guest-chamber and its furniture. He had also to provide two hogsheads of wine for the use of the guests, and provender for their cattle, with three men to wait upon them. The chamberlain provided the bedding and clothing of the novices, which were always of wool. The master of the common-room had the duty of continually maintaining the fire there, and he was required moreover to have always in store a hogshead of wine for the monks, with spices, figs, and

walnuts for their Lent fasts. The prior's chaplain received from the bursar all sums of money due to the prior; he also provided the prior's apparel, furniture, and linen, and took charge of his plate and money. He accounted with the officers and servants of the prior of whatever rank and degree, and saw that they performed their duties quietly and with diligence.

One of the customs peculiar to the early ages of the country, and no doubt necessary for them, but which as soon as a good and efficient system of government began to be established in the country was at once done away, was the privilege of sanctuary. By this privilege criminals might repair to certain pre-appointed spots, and for a space of time receive exemption from the punishment of the law, and in cases of homicide from the vengeance of the next of heir. The king, being the vicar of Christ, conveyed this privilege first by his presence, which extended to the palace and three miles round it, and secondly, by his seal. The monastic church of Durham was one of those to which this privilege was granted; the minster of Beverley was another. The sanctuary extended in the former case merely to the church and churchyard, in the latter it comprised the space of a mile from the minster every way, and the stones (one of them at least) which marked the boundary are still to be seen.

The 'Rites of Durham' gives us a description of the manner of the culprit's seeking sanctuary, and the '*Sanctuarium Dunelmense et Sanctuarium Beverlacense*' gives a history of the cases which sought and obtained sanctuary. The right of sanctuary was for the benefit of the graver malefactors; of those, for instance, who had committed manslaughter in their own defence, of those guilty of felony, horse-stealing, treason, coining, breaking of prison, and the like.

From the 'Rites of Durham' we extract the following account of the manner of a culprit seeking sanctuary. After the commission of his crime he—

'Fled to the Church dore and knocking and rapping at yt to have yt opened there were certen men that dyd lye alwaies in two chambers' [in a room is the correction of the Hunter MS.] 'over the said North Church dour, for the same purpose that when any such offenders dyd come and knocke streight waie they were letten in at any hour of the nyght, and dyd rynne streight waie to the Galleley bell, and tould it, to th' intent that any man that hard it might knowe that there was some man that had taken saunctuarie. And when the Prior had intelligence thereof, then he dyd send word, and commanding that that they should keape themselves within the saunctuarij, that is to say within the church and churchyard; and every one of them to have a gowne of blacke cloth maid with a cross of yeallow cloth, called Sancte Cuthbert's cross, sett on his lefte shoulder of his arme, to th' intent that every one might se that there was such a frelige graunted by God and Sanct Cuthbert, for every such offender to fly unto for succour and safeguard of their lyves, unto such

ty me as they might obtayne their Prince's pardone, and that thei should lie within the church or saunctuarij in a grate, which grate is remayninge and standing still to this daie, being maid onlie for the same purpose, standing and adjoining unto the Gallei dore on the south syde, and likewise they had meite, drink, and bedding, and other necessaries of the House cost and charg, for 37 daies, as was meite for such offenders, unto such time as the Prior and the Convent could gett theme conveyed out of the dioces. This freedom was confirmed not only by King Guthrid but also by King Alured.²—*Riles of Durham*, pp. 35, 36.

The chamber, in question, is still visible over the north door of Durham cathedral, and the huge old knocker affixed to the door is believed to be that which was used to signify the applicant's need of admission. At Beverley the culprit betook himself to the Fridstol, or chair of peace (on which see Spelman's Glossary, v.v. Fridstoll, Fridstow, or Frithstow), which like that at Hexham is still preserved.

The offender was permitted at Durham to claim protection for forty days, during thirty-seven of which he was provided with food and bedding at the expense of the house. If at the expiration of this time he had not succeeded in making his peace, he appeared before the coroner, clothed in sackcloth, to confess his crime and abjure the realm. This was done in the terms following:—

'This hear thou, Sir Coroner, that I, M. of H., am a robber of sheep, or of any other beast, or a murderer of one, or of mo, and a felon of our Lord the King of England, and because I have done many such evils or robberies in his land, I do abjure the land of our Lord Edward, King of England, and I shall haste me towards the port of such a place as thou hast given me: and that I shall not go out of the highway, and if I do, I will that I be taken as a robber and a felon of our Lord the King: and that at such a place I will diligently seek for passage, and that I will tarry there but one flood and ebb, if I can have passage; and unless I can have it in such a place, I will go every day into the sea up to my knees, assaying to pass over: and unless I can do this within forty days, I will put myself again into the Church as a robber and a felon of our Lord the King, so God me help and His holy judgement.'—*Sanct.* pp. xviii. xix.

In the event of the culprit failing to make this confession and abjuration within the time specified, he was compelled to leave the sanctuary, it being felony for any one to supply him with food. At Beverley they were treated with more leniency. If the offender was a person of distinction, he had a lodging in the dormitory or in a house within the precincts. The privilege itself ceased, indeed, at the end of thirty days; but it still protected him to the borders of the county, and he could claim the same security a second and even a third time; but in the latter case he became for life a servant of the church. The abstract of the Durham sanctuary shows, that during the sixty years it embraces (from 1464 to 1524), 195 persons were actually guilty of murder and homicide, and 283 implicated, 16 of debt, 4 of

horse-stealing, 9 of cattle-stealing, 4 of escaping from prison, 4 of housebreaking, 1 of rape, 7 of theft, 1 of being backward in his accounts, 1 of harbouring a thief, and 1 of failing to prosecute. The Beverley record extends from 1478 to 1539, and gives 173 guilty of murder and homicide, 186 implicated, 51 guilty of felony, and 54 implicated, 1 of horse-stealing, 1 of treason, 1 of receiving stolen goods, 7 of coining, and the large number 208 of debt; in addition are 35 crimes indefinite. The fact that the register of Durham contains the names of several Yorkshire persons, shows that a distant sanctuary was sometimes preferred to one nearer home, and if so, we are justified in concluding that the privilege itself might not have been in all cases preserved from violation.

The antiquity of the privilege is certainly very great. It is known that Ina, King of the West Saxons, recognised it in his code of laws, published in 693. Two centuries later, King Alfred confirmed it, and enacted that if any one violated it by inflicting on the fugitive bonds, blows or wounds, he should firstly recompense the victim by payment of the were, or fine allotted to the offence; and secondly, pay the fine of one hundred and twenty shillings—a large sum in those days—to the Church. After him, William the Conqueror, Henry II., Richard II. and Henry VIII., all recognised its existence, and made enactments for its protection, nor was it finally abolished till the 21st of James I. A.D. 1624.

The Durham Ritual has now to be considered. This work is said to be the oldest specimen of the ancient language of the kingdom of Northumbria yet published; and to the Anglo-Saxon scholar its worth as such is evidently great: whether it be equally so to the theologian we will endeavour to ascertain. We are informed in the preface of the learned and careful editor, Mr. Stevenson, that it claims from tradition to have been the ritual of Aldfrid, king of Northumbria, who reigned from 685 to 705.

But here we are compelled to raise one or two preliminary objections. First, as regards the title of the Durham Ritual. There is nothing to show that this was the true and original title of the volume; and even if this point could be substantiated, it does not follow that the work so described must necessarily have been used in the services of the Church of Northumbria. It may have obtained its appellation from having been in the library of the church of Durham, just as particularly rare and valuable copies in these days often take the name of the place in which they are deposited.

In the next place, we have been equally at a loss to discover any evidence connecting the 'Ritual' with Aldfrid. Wanley,

who has left a description of it in 'Hicke's Thesaurus,' merely says that he recognises in it the handwriting of Aldred the presbyter, whom he affirms (but without offering any proof of the statement) to have lived in the reign of Aldfrid; and Mr. Stevenson assures us that it cannot have been the copy actually used by that monarch, but is at best a mere transcript of it, for the appearance of the character in which it is written, to use his own words, prevents it from claiming a higher antiquity than the commencement of the ninth century; and we shall also find that evidence drawn from its contents forbids us to ascribe it to his day. There is, nevertheless, unquestionable proof that it really is of great antiquity. At page 143 there is a prayer for Bishop Aldhelm, and at page 185 are four collects for grace and mercy through the intercession of S. Cuthbert, following which is a memorandum in Saxon that they were written by the Provost Aldred upon the festival of S. Lawrence, on a Wednesday, when the moon was five days old, for Celfsig the Bishop.

Aldhelm was the founder of the city and church of Durham, in which he sat as bishop from 990 to 1018. Celfsig, the last Bishop of Chester-le-Street, was his immediate predecessor, and his episcopate dates from 968 to 990. Dr. Lingard proves that Aldred's inscription must have been written A.D. 970, as that is the only year in which the festival of S. Lawrence would fall at once on a Wednesday, and on the 5th day of the moon; and we learn from Mr. Stevenson that the original contents have been erased to make room for it. This proves that it must be at least as old as the latter part of the tenth century; how much older, we proceed, as far as the liturgical part of the evidence allows, to show.

We must first, however, describe a volume which, if we cannot accord to it all its title claims, is yet most interesting from its language, its antiquity and its contents. It consists of 199 pages, but it is far from perfect. The first part, containing the services from the Nativity to the Epiphany, is wanting, and there are essential omissions both in the *Proprium de Tempore*, and in the *Proprium Sanctorum*, in addition to which the work has suffered the loss of several leaves, and in more instances than the one adduced, the original contents have been erased to make room for other, and as it would seem, less important matter.¹

The book commences in the middle of a capitulum, or series of short extracts from Holy Scripture, apparently for the festival of Epiphany. These are followed by eight collects for the Epiphany, from which the first part of the work (or

Proprium de Tempore, as it is styled in the breviary) continues, with some omissions, to the festival of Pasch.; then after a Rogation service, and prayers *pro peccatis*, comes the Proprium Sanctorum, commencing with the festival of S. Stephen, and concluding with that of S. Thomas. The Commune Sanctorum which follows, concludes in the middle of a prayer for many martyrs; and to this succeeds a number of prayers, benedictions, forms of adjuration, charms, services of ordeals, hymns, exorcisms, and other unconnected and miscellaneous matter, written by different hands and in different characters, and entered, says the editor, on the blank pages, as in a commonplace book.

The question is, what is the place in theology, and what the ritualistic value of a work of which the contents are so diversified?

We answer at once that its value, as illustrating the order of Divine Service in the Anglo-Saxon Church, is very slight, for it is but a small portion that can be considered as a ritual at all. In this view we agree both with Mr. Stevenson and Dr. Lingard. To begin with the Proprium de Tempore. Many of the collects of this part of the work are found in the ancient sacramentaries of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory; but the most cursory inspection is enough to show that the breviary, rather than the old sacramentaries, is its original: with this difference, that each contains certain collects which are not found in the other. Thus there are eight collects for the Epiphany in the Ritual, of which three are in Gelasius, Gregory, and the breviary, and the rest are not to be found. The collects in the Ritual, from Septuagesima to the Passion inclusive, amount in number to sixty-five; of these seven are found in Gelasius and Gregory, and thirty-nine are taken from the breviary; of the origin of the remainder we are ignorant. It is to be wished, indeed, that these could be traced; but all we know is, that they are not in any of the sacramentaries—the Gothic, the Frankish, or either of the Gallican versions, contained in the work of Muratorius; and for anything that appears to the contrary, they may have been the composition of the compiler of the original work, of the transcriber of the present copy, or of any other private person.

We do not hesitate to say, that to us the Ritual bears much more the appearance of a book compiled from various sources for private devotion, than of one used in the public service of any Church.

It is Mr. Stevenson's opinion that the Ritual, if connected at all with King Aldfrid, may probably have been derived from Iona, where he was educated, and may, therefore, represent the

ritual of Britain, and not of Rome.¹ If this could be proved, it would undoubtedly be a relic of extraordinary value. But Bede's account of Aldfrid hardly bears out Mr. Stevenson's assertion. He says that Oswy, the father of Aldfrid, was instructed and baptized by the Scots, and thought nothing better than what they taught; but that Aldfrid, having been taught by Wilfrid, who had gone to Rome to learn the Ecclesiastical doctrine, thought that his doctrine ought to be preferred to the tradition of the Scots.² It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, as it strikes us, if a book of Aldfrid's bore, like the Ritual, so close a resemblance to the breviary as to be little other than a repetition of it. Nor must we forget that when S. Augustin landed in England there were in the island two different successions: the one, north of the Humber, derived from Iona, and introduced by Aidan and his successors; the other, south of that river, which had been planted by Germanus and Lupus. It is most probable that the ritual of each was different, and that their origin was derived from entirely different sources. There is no doubt as to the source of the original British ritual used south of the Humber; but there are two different opinions as to whence the other was derived, and as to what it was. Both opinions, of course, trace it through the monks of Iona to St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, but the learned are not agreed as to whence he himself obtained it. Some think he was consecrated by Germanus and Lupus, and adopted from them the Gallican ritual. Others follow the authority of his early biographers, who say that he received his apostolic commission from the hands of Pope Celestine: these naturally conclude that he brought with him the other Liturgy of the West, the Liturgy of Rome as it existed at that time, and with the Liturgy, the ritual. It is, indeed, barely possible, that the ritual reported to have been introduced into Ireland in the sixth century by David, Gildas, and Cadoc, all British saints, and which would, of course, be the Gallican, may have been carried from Ireland to Iona, and from thence into Northumbria; but there is no proof of this from history, and probability is much against the monks of Iona and the Church of Northumbria having changed their original ritual. If the Durham Ritual resembled the extant Gallican, which is the representative, as far as there is such, of the original British as opposed to the Roman, it would be made probable that the ritual of Iona, Ireland, and S. Patrick, was originally Gallican. But this is not the case. Putting out of the question the evidence afforded by the identity of so many of the collects

¹ Ritual, Preface, p. 9, note 2.

² Bede, iii, chap. 25.

with those in the old Roman sacramentaries and the breviary, its calendar is constructed on the model of theirs, and, with the exception of the interpolated collects at p. 185, mentioning the name of S. Cuthbert, the *Proprium Sanctorum* contains the names of no British Saint whatever. In the next place, even if we grant the ritual of Northumbria to have been the Gallican, derived either through St. Patrick from Germanus and Lupus, or from David, Gildas, and Cadoc, in the sixth century, still, before King Aldfrid's days, its use had begun to decline. S. Gregory, as we all know, had directed S. Augustin, eighty years before, to form a ritual and liturgy for the island, based on the Roman, but taking anything he thought worthy of adoption from the British; and it had been shown at the Council of Whitby, twenty years before Aldfrid's time, that even north of the Humber, the Roman order was gaining ground, and the original Northumbrian, where it now differed from the Roman, declining. The utmost that can be granted Mr. Stevenson is, that *some* of the collects, the source of which is unknown, may possibly have been derived from the primitive British or Gallican Ritual, assuming that ritual to have penetrated north of the Humber. Yet whilst there is nothing positive in favour of this view, the fact that none of them are at all similar to those in the Gallican sacramentary, will be thought to go much against it: the great number of collects, too, for many of the festivals, would tend to show that the Ritual followed the custom of the Roman Church, before S. Gregory the Great, in the end of the sixth, or beginning of the seventh century, diminished the number of collects left by his predecessors Leo and Gelasius.

The *Proprium Sanctorum* affords some positive data by which to judge of the antiquity and value of the work. These appear to overthrow the opinion of Dr. Lingard as to its probable origin. That historian, from the fact of its containing collects for the festival of the nativity of S. Martin of Tours, (Nov. 11), and for the translation of his relics (July 4), conjectured that the original of the Ritual may have been a work belonging to the monastery of S. Martin, at Tours, from whence a copy was perhaps brought to England by those who visited Alcuin there. He proceeds, however, to argue from the *Proprium Sanctorum* containing, as he says, the names of only one confessor (S. Benedict, which he thinks was undoubtedly interpolated after the reported transport of his remains to Fleury in 653), and from its having been the custom of the Church of Rome in early ages to reject from her calendar the names of doctors and confessors, and to admit those of martyrs only, that it is a work of Roman origin; and from its having

several collects for each of the greater festivals, he concludes that it is to be dated at some period before the reform of S. Gregory.

To these suggestions we answer as follows:—1. Competent judges have decided that the Durham Ritual was written by a Scotch or Irish scribe; for it contains features of resemblance in its material, style of execution, and other points, to MSS. of a known Irish origin. 2. The Roman and Gallican rituals were perfectly distinct both in their contents and calendar. S. Gregory reformed the one, but had nothing whatever to do with the other. This was the ritual used in the Gallican Church in the days of Aldfrid, and till the time of Charlemagne. When, therefore, Dr. Lingard concludes that it may have been a copy of a Roman sacramentary used in the Abbey of S. Martin, he seems to have forgotten that such a book in use at Tours at the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century, would have been an anomaly. Moreover, we know that the custom of those ages was rather to carry MSS. from England into France than to bring them from that country hither.

As to the mention of S. Martin's name among those of the saints, it is not at all needful to go to a Gallican source for that. Dr. Lingard could not have been aware that in those ages S. Martin was held in peculiar respect in Northumbria and the south of Scotland, and he is expressly said by Bede to have been the patron saint of Candida Casa, or Witheren, where Mirian, the apostle of the southern Picts, built a stone church and dedicated it to him.¹ From Candida Casa, afterwards erected into an episcopal see, we conclude that S. Martin's name found its way into the Durham Ritual, or its original, with collects composed either by Mirian himself or one of his successors. Certain it is, that the collects for S. Martin's two days in the Ritual resemble neither those of the breviary, nor of the Gallican sacramentary. Dr. Lingard ought to have noticed this discrepancy, and, if possible, have explained it; as it is, we think it alone almost fatal to his theory. Nor is it the fact that the Ritual excludes the names of confessors to the extent that he says. It seems to have escaped him that in addition to S. Benedict, it mentions Sylvester, ii. Kal. Jan. (30 Dec. p. 49); S. Felix, xviii. Kal. Feb. (15 Jan.) xix. in breviary; Marcellus xvi. Kal. Feb. (17 Jan.) xvii. in breviary; Eusebius Presbyter. xviii. Kal. Sep. (15 Aug.) xix. in breviary; and S. Mark, Pope, Nones of Oct. (7 Oct.). Of these, Sylvester, Eusebius, and Mark are expressly styled confessors in their collects; and as to Marcellus, the collect of the Ritual in which he is called

¹ Bede, book xiii. chap. 4.

'martyris,' is that of the breviary and the sacramentary of S. Gregory. In the earlier sacramentary of Gelasius he is called confessor; nothing is said by Baronius, Ruinart, or Butler, to show whether he was a martyr or confessor. His acts assert the former; but these are confessedly spurious, and from the indirect testimony of history, and from the sacramentary of Gelasius, it seems most probable that he was merely a confessor. It is remarkable that in addition to the names of confessors, the Ritual omits those of certain of the martyrs, as S. Polycarp, Ignatius, and others of like note; more even than this—and we cannot but consider it a further proof that the work never could have been the ritual of a Church—it makes no mention of the Apostles Matthias, Barnabas, and Matthew.

It is a significant fact, that while the Ritual omits the festivals of these Apostles, it contains some of which the antiquity is more than questionable: *e.g.* those of the Nativity (of B.V.M.), and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of All Saints. For the first, Pope Sergius appointed a litany and homilies in 688. Bede (A.D. 673-735) mentions it in his martyrology, and Archbishop Boniface A.D. 755, speaks of it with other festivals in his canons, as they are given by D'Acheri in the ninth vol. of his *Spicilegium*, and directs it to be observed on the vi. Ides or 8th of September. Moreover, although it has a mass and collect in the sacramentary of Gelasius and Gregory, there is no mention of the day in the more ancient one of S. Leo, and it is wanting in the Gothic, Frankish, and the two versions of the Gallican sacramentary given by Muratorius.

The Festival of the Assumption is admitted even by some Romish ritualists to have been instituted as late as the eighth century. Pope Sergius, indeed, mentions it with the Nativity (of B.V.M.), but under the term 'Dormitio,' which conveys—whatever Romish writers may say—a totally different idea to that contained in the word 'assumptio.' The first formal and public mention of the Festival of the Assumption seems to have been made in the Council of Mentz, A.D. 813; the thirty-fifth canon of which enumerates it with some others.¹ It was celebrated in the Gallican Church on the 18th of January, on which day collects are appointed for it both in the Gothic and Gallican sacramentaries.² Those of Gelasius,³ and Gregory,⁴ and the Martyrology of Bede, put it on the xviii. Kal. Sep. (Aug. 15).

But when reliance is placed on the ancient sacramentaries, not merely as a whole (in which respect it cannot be doubted that they represent with fidelity the ancient services of the Latin

¹ Harduin, tom. iv. p. 1015.

³ Muratorius, vol. i. 663.

² Muratorius, vol. ii. pp. 45, 811.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 114.

Church), but also in each particular service, we must remember that the authorship of S. Leo's (the most ancient of all and the foundation of the others) is matter of doubt; the name of that pope having been given to it only by conjecture and the evidence of probability; and that the exact date of the MSS. of his and the other sacramentaries is not known with any certainty, and has to be settled almost entirely from internal evidence. Muratorius admits that the true authorship of Leo's sacramentary cannot be decided, and that it is not at all known what was the order of the services in the Latin Church for the first four centuries. He prints the sacramentary of S. Gregory from a MS. which dates no further back than about the first half of the ninth century; and in our estimation he is perfectly correct, when he prefers his own version to that of Menard, and affirms that it is the most ancient, and therefore the best representative of the genuine text of S. Gregory of any yet discovered. But he admits, firstly, that no copy showing the pure and veritable text of the work is extant or is now to be hoped for;¹ secondly, that all have additions of festivals since S. Gregory's time; thirdly, that the Festival of the Assumption in particular was not known either to Gelasius or to Gregory; but, like some others was inserted into their sacramentaries at some subsequent period; and he makes the simple remark, that as no one doubts the sacramentary of S. Gregory to be his because it contains certain prayers, festivals, and rites, which were evidently added since his death, so neither do the interpolations which it cannot be denied have been made in that of Gelasius, at all weaken our confidence that is the veritable work of that pope.² Our readers will readily reply that such adulterations do very materially diminish our confidence in both. It is evidently impossible to say what amount of addition was made during the two centuries and a half that elapsed between the death of S. Gregory and the transcription of the most ancient copies now extant of his sacramentary; and consequently the presence of a particular festival or festivals does not prove that such were necessarily known to its original author, or formed any part of the service of the Church in which it was used during his life.

But the Ritual contains in itself clearer evidence than the presence of these collects, that it never could have been used *as it stands* by King Aldfrid. It has four collects for the festival of All Saints. This was instituted the last of all the festivals, that of Trinity Sunday excepted. Martene, Baronius, and Butler, who follows Baronius, say that it was established by the middle of the eighth century. It is not

¹ Muratorius, i. p. 63—78.

² Ibid. vol. i. pp. 58, 59.

mentioned by the Council of Mentz; but we find from the 'Metrical Martyrology' of Bede that it was celebrated in his time. Bede, who died in 735, thus alludes to it:—

'Multiplici rutillet gemma ceu in fronte November
Cunctorum fulget sanctorum laude decorus.'

And lastly, the day is mentioned by Archbishop Egbert, in his 'Pontificale,' which was composed towards the middle of the eighth century. If, indeed, we follow Lingard, we must put it at the end of that century, such being the date ascribed to it by him from a passage in a letter written by Alcuin in the year 799. This would make the original work of the same antiquity as that ascribed to the copy, from the evidence of the penmanship &c., by Mr. Stevenson: but as his premiss is so evidently erroneous, his conclusion may be false also; and this we think to be the case. The MS. in our estimation may, indeed, be substantially the copy of a work which was used by King Aldred, but with the addition of particular festivals, such as was made to the sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory in a subsequent age, certainly showing that it was not transcribed, at the earliest, till about thirty years after his death.

The forms of exorcism, consecration, &c. in the Ritual are not peculiar to it. Some of them are found also in the Missal. Some agree both with the Missal and with Goar's *Euchologium* as used by the Greek Church; and what is the most singular feature of the case, some correspond closely with the *Euchologium* and have nothing at all in common with the Missal. Thus there are two forms of exorcism of salt in the Ritual. The first, at page 117, very closely resembles, and the second, at page 119, is to a word identical with, that in the Missal. The same is the case with the two consecutive forms of exorcising and consecrating water. The first of these in the Durham Ritual ends abruptly in the middle of a word, 'Jesus Christus qui ven—.' The form in the Missal enables us to supply what is wanting: 'venturus est judicare vivos et mortos et sæculum per ignem. Amen.' So, also, with the prayer for the blessing of salt and water, at the 122d page of the Ritual: a few words have dropped out from the commencement, which the form in the Missal enables us at once to supply and correct. The former runs as follows: 'Deus . . . virtutis auctor et inseparabilis . . . rex.' We find it in the Missal: 'Deus invictæ virtutis auctor et insuperabilis imperii rex.' The Ritual contains a few other verbal errors, the result apparently of the scribes' ignorance of the Latin language. Thus the 'qui hostiles nequitias potens expugnans' in the

Ritual, the Missal reads correctly, 'potenter expungas;' and again, 'more,' in the expression 'ut pietatis tuæ *more* sanctifices' in the Ritual, is corrected by the Missal to '*rore*.'

The following form for exorcising salt is taken from the Ritual; and while differing in letter from one in the Missal, is the same in spirit.

'I exorcise thee, O thou creature of Salt, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who commanded thee to be cast by Elisha into the water that the sterility of the same might be healed: who said with His Divine voice to His Apostles, Ye are the salt of the earth; that all who take of it (*sic*) may be made whole in mind and body, and whereon it is sprinkled it may afford to all remission of sins, and healing to the protection of health, that all temptations of the Devil may be driven away and shut out from them, in the name of God the Father Almighty, and of Jesus Christ His Son, who is about to come in the Holy Ghost and judge the world through fire.'—P. 117.

In Goar it is as follows:—

'O God our Saviour, who was present to Elisha the prophet in Jericho, and healedst by means of *salt* the hurtful waters, do Thou bless this salt, and change it into a sacrifice of rejoicing (*εἰς θυσίαν ἀγαλλιασέως*),¹ for Thou art ever God, and to Thee, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we ascribe the glory now and ever and ever.'—P. 105.

Of the last class, those forms, namely, which correspond to none in the Missal, but are similar to certain contained in the Euchologium, is that of a blessing on meat. The Anglo-Saxon prayed that God would bless his banquet as He blessed those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and changed the water into wine at the marriage feast. The Greek prayed Him, as the Heavenly Bread which came down from above and gave life to the world, and as the true nourishment of every man, to bless the food and drink, and to suffer them to be partaken without condemnation. For a blessing on his nets, the Anglo-Saxon prayed as follows:—

'Let Thy plentiful blessing, we beseech Thee, O Lord, come upon these nets, that for the hunting of beasts, through the gift of Thy grace and the benefactions of Thy bounty, we may merit to pay Thee heavenly thanks (*celestes gratias tibi absolvere mereamur*).'²—P. 117.

Again:—

'Grant, we pray Thee, Almighty God, through aspersion of this water and holy salt, Thou mayst command these nets which are signed in Thy Name to be made fruitful for human service to the taking of beasts, that we may refer to Thee for Thy praise everything which through Thy grace we may merit to partake—per Dominum, &c.'

In Goar we find the following prayer on the same subject:—

¹ Goar thinks, from these words, that the whole prayer bears reference to the salt which the Greeks used with leaven in the bread of the Holy Eucharist; but there is nothing in the anarthrous *θυσίαν* to fix this sense to the words.

‘O Lord our God, who from five loaves and two fishes didst satisfy five thousand, and of the fragments commandedst a quantity to be collected; Do Thou, the same Lord Almighty, bless these nets which are placed before Thee through the *προσβειων* of our superlatively blessed glorious Lady, the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, and the holy, glorious, and all celebrated Apostle Peter; and guard those that eat of the fish taken by them, in peace and health both of body and mind: for Thou art the Giver of all good things, and to Thee do we ascribe the glory, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and for ever and ever. Amen.’

To account for this resemblance is a matter of difficulty. Where the forms agree in all the books, it is clear that there must have been some original source which the others copied, and this would probably be found in the Roman book. But we know not how to explain the agreement between the Ritual and the Euchologium alone, except by a supposition which may or may not find favour in the eyes of our readers. We suggest that it may be traceable to Archbishop Theodore, who was a Greek by birth, and the first Archbishop of Canterbury who was able to exercise his metropolitical powers over the whole island. He, or his scholars, of whom we know that he had a numerous and able staff, may have introduced into the Anglo-Saxon a form, or forms, of prayer derived from the Greek Church; and as Theodore died in the year 690, we might naturally look for any remains of his in a MS. of the date of the later portion of the Durham Ritual. And if it be objected that there are many forms in the Euchologium which bear no resemblance to those in the Ritual on the same subject, we reply that this may be thought a fact confirmatory rather than destructive of our suggestion. For Theodore is known to have thoroughly identified himself as a divine with the Latin Church in her growing discords with that of the Greeks, and therefore his bent and feelings would not have allowed him to incorporate into the one much that was derived from the other.

With one more curious extract we will close our notice of the Durham Ritual.

In the Anglo-Saxon forms of exorcising *boiling water* and *heated iron* in trials by ordeal, we see that what to us savours of romance and marvel, was to our ancestors a matter of most profound faith, and earnest, solemn reality: a direct appeal to the judgment of God, which could by no possibility err, and which no man might doubt or gainsay. The following form of exorcising heated iron for the detection of crime is found in the original portion of the Ritual. We do not know it to be that which was used in the Church of Northumbria for the purpose, but it may have been; and if so, it would probably, *mutatis mutandis*, be the same in substance as that employed in the case

of Emma, queen-mother of Edward the Confessor. For although the 'Consuetudo,' as it was termed, or, as we translate it, the 'Use,' of Winchester was not the same as that of Durham or York; yet the ritual of the country in those ages was, as a whole, one from which the 'Uses' were merely local and slight variations. Under these circumstances, and as the form is so interesting in itself, and bears reference to a custom so well known and so peculiar, we venture to offer our readers a translation of it:—

"O God, who showing through fire great wonders didst pluck Thy servant Abraham from the fire of the Chaldees when many perished: O God, who sufferedst the bush to burn in the sight of Moses, yet not to be consumed: O God, who broughtest from the burning furnace of Chaldaea Thy three children when many perished therein: O God, who involvedst in the consuming fire the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, and gavest salvation to Lot Thy servant and his household: O God, who before Thy coming by the purification of Thy Holy Spirit of Fire didst separate thy Faithful from Thine Unfaithful; show us in this test of our littleness the virtue of the same Holy Spirit, and by the heat of this Fire separate the believing and unbelieving, that, conscious by its touch of theft or other crime of which inquisition is made, their hands may be shrivelled up, or their feet may in some measure be burned; but if free, let them be wholly delivered from its operation and remain without hurt."—
P. 112.

Our conclusion as to this remarkable work is then, on the whole, that it is a compilation of collects from old sacramentaries and the breviary, mingled with prayers from some other source or sources unknown; and that while it is exceedingly doubtful that it ever belonged to King Aldfrid, it may be certainly granted to be nearly or quite as old as the most ancient copies of the sacramentaries now in existence. The copy of Leo's sacramentary published by Blanchinus is perhaps the most ancient *copy*, as well as the most ancient sacramentary, of any; but Blanchinus himself does not venture to put it further back than from the eighth to the ninth century; there is mention in it of Simplicius, who was pope after Leo's time; whilst Muratorius supposes it to belong rather to Felix III. than to S. Leo: and the same is the case with the other two sacramentaries. That of Gelasius, edited by Thomasius, is given by Basnage to the tenth century, but is judged by Muratorius to be one hundred years older. Muratorius' own copy of the sacramentary of Gregory, he says, is at least the second most ancient known, yet it dates no further back, as we have said before, than the first half of the ninth century: the earlier copy, which is in the Vatican, apparently belonging quite to the beginning of that century. This would appear to be the transcript of a yet older work; for it has no festival for All Saints, nor any service for the Rogation Days; yet it may not be

itself older as a copy than the Durham Ritual. And as, of course, the Durham Ritual shares in the doubtfulness of these copies, though it be as old as any of them, these circumstances render it of much more value to the antiquarian than it can be to the Liturgical scholar.

A pontificale is a service book containing those offices—of ordination, consecration, the coronation of kings, the giving of certain benedictions, and in the Western Church, confirmation—which a bishop only can perform. Martene gives extracts from several works of this class which have been used in different churches, amongst which is that of S. Dunstan; but until the publication by the Surtees Society of Archbishop Egbert's, the only pontificale in print was that now in use in the Church of Rome. It is significant and instructive to compare the two.

Egbert's Pontificale commences with the service for the consecration of a bishop. Its chief component parts are the prayers for God's presence and grace on the person ordained; the unction of his hands and head; the bestowal of the pastoral staff and ring; and the episcopal benedictions on the bishop and host. In these points the Pontificale of Egbert agrees with the one now in use in the Roman Church. But there are in the essential points of the service many and grave differences between them. Egbert's Pontificale makes the spiritual power conferred to be given immediately and solely by God: 'Da ei Domine claves regni cœlorum ut quodcumque ligaverit super terram sit ligatum et in cœlis, et quodcumque solverit super terram sit solutum in cœlis, et quorum detinuerit peccata detenta sint, tu Domine, dimittere digneris.' The modern office implies that such power is bestowed only through S. Peter and his successors the popes. Egbert merely speaks of that Apostle as chosen firstly to the chair of honour, and enumerates S. Matthias as sharing with him and the other Apostles both in his Apostleship and in the same chair of honour, praying finally that the newly consecrated bishop may be not *their* servant merely, to give account to them, but their equal. The result of this difference is, that Egbert's book contains none of the vows of obedience to S. Peter and the Church of Rome, the Pope or the papal nuncios and legates, which are found in the Roman Pontificale; nor does he, like the latter, make the newly consecrated bishop accountable to the Pope. This work, therefore, contains fresh proof, if any were needed, not merely that the Church in this island was originally free from the control of that of Rome; but also, which is still more important, and has often been denied by Romish controversialists, that the introduction of the Romish succession, customs, and ritual by S. Augustine and his successors, whilst

bringing the two Churches into close communion, did not place the British on the footing of a servant or subject to the Romish. There is sufficient evidence in this part of Egbert's work to show that the Roman Pontificale was his model in compiling it: more than one of the prayers are identical, and the ceremonies of enduing the new bishop with the symbols of his office, the unction of his hands, the giving of the pastoral staff, the putting on of the ring, are, in fact, the same in both: only, whilst the modern pontificale binds every bishop consecrated with its rites to be the servant of the successor of S. Peter, and whomsoever he may depute to fill his office for the time being, it is clear that Archbishop Egbert considered himself as possessed in his office of the same essential power and the same freedom as the Bishop of Rome himself. No one, taking his book as it stands, could imagine that there was any earthly potentate to whom he considered himself and those whom he consecrated bishops to be accountable.

The form of ordination of the other seven orders of clergy acknowledged by the Church of Rome may be dismissed very briefly. The Roman Pontificale is again for the most part the model of the services in Egbert's book. An address in Egbert's form of ordination of readers gives what is not in the Pontificale of Rome: the reason of admitting so many orders and no more, viz. she considers Christ to have filled them.

'He was an *ostiarus* when He opened the door of the ark of Noah and the gates of hell: He was a *reader* when He opened the Book of the Prophet Isaiah in the Jewish synagogue and read, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me:" He was an *exorcist* when He cast out the seven devils from Mary Magdalene: He was a *subdeacon* when He blessed the water at the marriage feast and turned it into wine: He was a *deacon* when He broke the five loaves among the five thousand men, and the seven loaves among the four thousand, and when He washed the feet of His disciples: He was a *presbyter* when He took in His holy hands the bread and the cup, and looked up to heaven and gave thanks and blessed them: He was a *bishop* when with uplifted hands He blessed the disciples at Bethany, and leading them out was taken up into heaven.'

We gather from the Pontificale of Egbert that one doctrine, at least, of modern Rome—that of offering spiritual service for the dead—was unknown to the Church of the Anglo-Saxons. The Roman Pontificale, in the service for the ordination of deacons, gives them 'the power of reading the Gospel in church for the living as for the dead.' Archbishop Egbert when giving them a copy of the Gospels simply charges them to read, understand, hand them down to others, and fulfil them by their own works. In like manner, the commission given to priests in the Roman Pontificale, 'of offering sacrifice to God and celebrating mass as well for the living as for the dead,' is wholly wanting

in Egbert's. The Anglo-Saxon Church, as we find from this volume, also followed the primitive Liturgies, in offering prayers that spiritual gifts might be bestowed through her agency, instead of positively declaring that they were so, as is the more modern custom, at least, in the West. Thus the service for the ordination of priests prays simply that powers and graces may be given to him, and contains nothing at all answering to the gifts of the keys in the Romish Pontificale and our own ordinal.

The Society has also conferred on us a few works illustrative of the early language of our island, prominent among which stands the 'Townley Mysteries.' This is a collection of those miracle plays or mysteries, which were so popular with our ancestors, and the revival of which has, as we know, been attempted in the present day in the south of France. The 'Townley Mysteries' were compiled, as the editor gives good reason to conclude, by the monks, either of Woodkirk or of Nostel, in Yorkshire. They consist of dramatic poems on different Scripture subjects. The first is on the creation, and the *dramatis personæ* are Jehovah himself, and the good and bad angels:—

‘Ego sum Alpha et O,
I am the First and Last also,
One God in Magiste.
Marvelose of myght most,
Fader, Son, and Holy Ghost,
One God in Trinite.’

Jehovah is then represented as leaving His throne, on which Lucifer, induced by pride and presumption, seats himself. A dialogue ensues between the good and evil angels; the former remonstrating, the latter supporting their leader, after whose fall we find in the lament of the first demon an allusion to the Rabbinical traditions, one of which makes Satan to have been the first in rank of all creatures, and the nearest to Jehovah himself:—

‘What alyd the Lucifer to falle,
Was thou not farist of angels alle,
Brightest and best and most of luf,
With God hymself that syttes aboyf?’

And the other, borrowed by Origen and adopted by S. Anselm, that there were originally ten orders of angels, and that the tenth of each order fell with Lucifer:—

‘Ten orders in Heven were,
Of Angels that had office sere,
Of ich order in thare degree,
The ten parte felle down with me.
For they held with me that tyde,
And mantenyd me in my pride.’

God is next represented as creating man after the fall of Satan, according to the common idea of the times, that the number of the fallen angels might be filled up and perfected by that of the saved among men, which, it was also thought, was to equal the number of lost angels.¹

‘ Alle that is in water or land,
It shall bowe unto this Hand,
And sufferan shalle thou be.
I gif the witt—I gif the strength,
Of alle thou sees of brede and lengthe,
Thou shalte be wonde wise:
Myrthe and joy to have at wille,
All thi liking to fulfille,
And dwelle in paradise.’

Eve is then created, and charge is given to the cherubim to place them in Eden; and the MS. ends abruptly with the avowed determination of Satan and his crew to procure their ejection:—

‘ Herken felows what I say,
The joy that we have lost for aye,
God has maide man with his hend,
To have that blis withouten end,
The nine ordre to fulfille.
That after we left, sich is his wille,
And now are they in Paradise,
Bot thens they shalle if we be wise.’

The patriarchs are introduced in other poems, Noah as issuing from the ark, Abraham as about to sacrifice Isaac, Isaac as blessing Jacob, Jacob as fleeing before Esau. The prophets; Pharaoh, Moses, Augustus Cæsar, Herod, and John the Baptist are also brought on the stage with many others. There is the Annunciation; the Salutation of Elizabeth; the Dialogue of the Shepherds; the Offering of the Magi; the Betrayal, Scourging, and Crucifixion; the Ascension and the Final Judgment; the whole concluding with a fragment in the form of a monologue on the death of Judas Iscariot. From the salutation of Elizabeth, which is one of the most characteristic and poetical pieces of the whole, we offer our readers the following extract:—

‘ *M.* My lord of heven that syttyt he,
And alle thyng seys withe ee,
The safe Elizabethhe.
E. Welcom Mary blyssed blome,
Joyfulle am I of thi come,
To me from Nazarethe.
M. How standes it with you of quart? (heart)
E. Welle my doghter and dere hart,
As can for myn elde.

¹ See S. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, book i. chap. xvi.—xviii.

- M.* To speke with you me thocht fulle lang,
For ye with childe in elde gang,
And ye be cald geld.
- E.* Fulle lang shalle I the better be,
That I may speke my fylle with the,
My dere kyns-woman.
To wytt how thi freyndes fare,
In thi countre where thay are,
Thereof telle me thou can.
And how thou farys my dere derlyng?
- M.* Welle dame, gramercy youre asking,
For good I wot ye speir.
- E.* And Joachym thy fader at hame,
And Anna my nese and thi dame,
How standes it with hym and hir?
- M.* Dame, yit are thay bothe on lyfe,
Bothe Joachim and Anna his wyfe,
- E.* Elles were my hart full sare.
- M.* Dame God that alle may
Yeld you that you say,
And blys you therefore.
- E.* Blyssed be thou of alle women,
And the fruyte that I welle ken,
Within the wombe of the.
And this tyme may I blyss,
That my lorde's moder is,
Comen thus unto me.
For syn that tyme fulle welle I wote,
The steven of Angelle voice it smote,
And rang now in myne ere.
A selcouthe thyng is me betyde,
The chylde makes joy as any byrd,
That I in body bere.
And als Mary blessed be thou,
That stedfastly wold trow,
The wordes of our heven Kyng.
Therefore all thyng shall now be brend,
That unto the were sayd or send,
By the Angell gretynge.'

Mary then utters the Magnificat, after which, from the nature of the case, we suppose, though contrary to the order of the Gospels, she at once takes her leave of Elizabeth:—

- M.* Elezebethe my awnt dere,
My lefe I take at you here,
For I dwelle now fulle lang.
- E.* Wyll thou now go Gode's fere,
Come kys me doghter with good chere,
Or thou hend gang.
Fare welle now thou frely foode,
I pray thee be of comfurthe goode,
For thou art fulle of grace;

Grete welle alle our kyn of bloode,
That Lord that the with grace infude,
He save alle in this place.'

Before we take our leave of this valuable and instructive collection of works, we will recommend to the Anglo-Saxon scholar, the Society's edition of the 'Lindisfarne Gospels,' and of the 'Anglo-Saxon and Early English Psalter.' The former consists of a transcript of the Gospel of S. Matthew, according to the Vulgate, with an interlineary Anglo-Saxon version; the latter of the Psalter, also from the Vulgate, with an Anglo-Saxon version, with the addition of a poetical translation in early English. Of this we should have been glad, had space allowed, to give a few specimens.

Not the least interesting work of the series is that which contains the life of Mr. Surtees himself, by the late lamented Dr. Raine. He was the friend of many of the *literati* of the period, and among the rest of Sir Walter Scott; and we cannot forbear a wish, as we close the volume, that the 'great magician' could have had the use of so many works of a kind that he delighted in. This we cannot doubt would at once have greatly pleased himself, and from the use he might have made of some of them, would have been a benefit of no small amount to the nation at large.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Present Position of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.* By EDWARD B. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Dean of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Grant. London: Rivingtons.

2. *An Appeal. The Scottish Civil Disabilities of 1792. The Scottish Communion Office and Civil and Religious Liberty.* By a LAYMAN of the Scottish Episcopal Church. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1862.

ON the 16th of April, 1746, the issue of the battle of Culloden put an end to all the hopes of the adherents of the House of Stuart. It was followed, as was natural, by the attainder of the most active and distinguished partisans of the fallen dynasty. As the Earl of Derwentwater and Lord Kenmure had suffered death upon the scaffold in 1715, so now, for the same cause and with equal dignity, did the Earl of Kilmarnock and Lord Balmerino lay down their lives—

‘Pitied by gentle hearts Kilmarnock died;
The brave, Balmerino, were on thy side.’

Both in 1716 and 1746 the titles and estates of many nobles who escaped, or obtained pardons, were forfeited.

But no sooner was the House of Hanover seated firmly upon the throne, than, to its great and lasting honour, it commenced a series of reversals of these attainders. In some cases, indeed, the failure of the direct line, or other circumstances, may have thwarted these conciliatory measures. The ample estates of Lord Derwentwater still support Greenwich Hospital, and have not returned to any member of the house of Ratcliff. But even so early as 1760, George III. restored the family of the Earl Marischal (Keith) to its ancient honours. A similar course of action was pursued throughout his long reign and in that of his successor. The last of the Stuarts in the male line, Cardinal York, received from the Prince Regent (afterwards George IV.) a pension of 4,000*l.* a year; and when he died in 1807, the monument raised to his memory in St. Peter's, Rome, was ordered, and its expense defrayed, by the same benefactor. Different opinions may be entertained about the merit of Canova's workmanship (though this particular monument has always seemed to us one of his best), but there can be but one opinion about the truly princely character of the act. Well, indeed, may we say, *O si sic omnia!* In this reign the chief of the clan Ogilvy was rehabilitated in his earldom; and the

present lord of 'the bonnie house of Airlie' confronts as a representative peer the head of the once hostile clan of the Campbells. But the most marked instance of reversal has been reserved for the reign of our present Sovereign. There was condemned, together with Lords Kilmarnock and Balmerino, another peer, the Earl of Cromarty; but his sentence was remitted in so far as concerned his life.¹ To the beautiful representative of this condemned nobleman, the present Duchess of Sutherland, the Queen has extended an extraordinary act of favour. The title of 'Countess of Cromarty in her own right' has been granted to this lady, with remainder to her *second* son, so that it may not hereafter be merged in the dukedom to which the eldest is heir.

In no one instance, we believe, has the passage of these bills of reversal through the Houses of Parliament been opposed. Nor has there been any miserable haggling about terms. No implied slight upon the memory of ancestors, no resignation of one particle of Scottish law, of Scottish use or custom, has ever been sought at the hands of the restored chieftains, as a condition of their restitution to the rights and dignities enjoyed by their forefathers. No; the gift has been re-bestowed in a manner worthy of the great Sovereigns of a great nation. Homage and allegiance (long previously rendered) have been asked—and nothing more.

And as these restorations have been given, so, too, have they been received. The reigning House has no more loyal subjects than the descendants of the councillors who met Prince Charles Edward in his drawing-room at Holyrood, such as Lochiel, Lord George Murray, Lord Nairne. The Lord Elcho of 1745 was amongst the last to quit the field of Culloden; the Lord Elcho of 1862 is amongst the foremost originators and leaders of those Volunteers who rally round the throne of Queen Victoria.

And yet, strange to say, there is one class of men, one only, which still suffers because their predecessors adhered to the conquered cause. While the *natural* heirs of those who imperilled the Hanoverian rule enjoy their ancient power and position, the *spiritual* descendants of the Scottish bishops of that date remain under a ban of English *State* (not *Church*) law, from which priests of the Greek and Roman Churches are exempt. To this day, no clergyman ordained by the bishops in Scotland is permitted to hold the smallest preferment—no, not even a curacy—in England; nor can he (without a constantly

¹ The pardon was granted simply because it was desirable to show *some* clemency, and not to put all three lords to death. The reasons for selecting Lord Cromarty are given by Sir Walter Scott and other historians of the time.

renewed license) officiate for more than two consecutive days. That they should not be placed in all respects on a *perfect* level, as regards preferment, with clergy ordained in England may be right and reasonable; but so long as the present state of the law exists, so long must we consider it a blot upon the English code, a blemish on the fair scutcheon from which every other trace of anti-Stuartite legislation has long since vanished.

On political grounds, solely and exclusively, were those disabilities imposed. No theological question whatever was mixed up with the laying on of these restrictions; and surely to every fair and generous mind it must be obvious, as a natural consequence, that no such question *ought* to be mixed up with the taking off this yoke. In the case of the Churches of Rome, of the East, of America, no hint of such a difficulty has ever been made. One of the most distinguished members of the Lower House of Convocation has received American Orders. When the bill for enabling him to hold an English living passed through Parliament, did any layman, did any prelate, say one word about the national office in use in America?

Now, other and better reasons for not treating the Scotch orders like those of Rome, Greece, or the United States, *may* exist; but it is, unfortunately, quite impossible to exclude all suspicion of an element which, whether its intrusion be consciously felt or not, is but too likely to exercise great influence. It is this: that the other communions to which we have alluded are large and powerful, whereas that which is presided over by Scottish bishops is, comparatively, very small and weak.

Let it not be said that, in speaking thus, we are adducing a novel charge, or playing an unpatriotic part. It is not a novel charge, for though there are moments when the better mind of England triumphs, and raises her far above all such unworthy considerations, yet, alas! too often does she sink below that lofty standard of thought and action, and justly incur, on this head, the language of warning and rebuke. Nor is it from foreign lands alone that such a voice proceeds. We hear it (and it is a good sign that it should be heard) from our own press, our own political leaders and historians. Thus, some sixteen years since, did a Quarterly Reviewer, in connexion with our present subject, speak 'of that inclination to domineer, in which, manifestly, we are to reckon one of our besetting sins.' Thus, at the present moment, do the Scotch lawyers complain, and with too much foundation, of the great disregard shown to North British law in the cases of appeals to the House of Lords. Thus did Lord Derby, with his wonted eloquence, lay down the rule that, in addressing a small power like that of Greece, the Foreign Minister ought to couch all documents in language as

courteous and deferential as that employed towards great powers, such as Russia or the United States; or that if any distinction were made, it should be in favour of the weaker nation. Not very dissimilar is the insinuation conveyed in the following words of a thinker of a very different stamp, Dr. Arnold:—‘Elizabeth’s own views were shared by a large portion of her people; they utterly abhorred the papal supremacy, with an English feeling quite as much as a religious one; it is not clear that they would have abhorred it equally had the papal see been removed for ever from Rome to Canterbury, and the Pope been necessarily an Englishman.’¹ It is making Canterbury resemble Rome, in one of its most oppressive characteristics, if, in order to enjoy full communion with the English Church, other Churches are to be called upon to use her liturgy, and none other.

Most unhappily, as it seems to us, two questions, in no wise necessarily connected, have become entangled with each other: by what agency, we will not pause to ask, but content ourselves, at present, with recognising and deploring the fact. Whether certain political disabilities, imposed on purely political grounds, shall be removed or not is one question; whether a certain communion office shall be abolished or not is another. So far are the two points from standing or falling together, that we can assert from our own knowledge that Scottish Churchmen, both lay and cleric, will be found to exhibit in the presence of these two questions every possible variety of attitude. There are those who earnestly desire to retain the office, and are perfectly indifferent on the score of the disabilities; there are others as indifferent about the disabilities, who are eager for the abolition of the office; a third section desire that both should cease to exist; a fourth that both should remain.

For our own part, we should be glad to see England blot out a badge and remnant of a strife long since passed away, in a manner worthy of her best and truest self; in the same generous and lofty spirit as she has revoked the attainders of the temporal peers. Nor can we feel much doubt as to the effect upon the relieved clergy. The Scottish Bishops would be gainers. Their influence would be extended, and that most naturally and legitimately, when they could hold out to those on whom they laid hands the possibility of not being confined to Scotland and the Colonies. And if the offer of a place of influence, of a valuable preferment in England might, now and then, deprive Scotland of a gifted son, yet the loss would, we firmly believe, be more than compensated by the general stimulus given to the

¹ Lectures on Modern History, Lect. V. p. 203.

order. The laity would also be gainers, though in a different way. It has always seemed to us to be a great misfortune to the lairds in Scotland, a real drawback to their spiritual welfare, that they are so very seldom confronted with clergy of their own rank. In this respect, their lot is a great contrast to that of the English squire. We do not, of course, mean (forbid the thought!) that a priest is rendered the less God's commissioned servant by having less of earthly station. But secondary motives do so powerfully intertwine themselves with the life and actions of all but deeply and ardently pious spirits, that it is apt to exercise a very lowering influence on the religion of any class, if they see the service of God's ministry almost constantly dissevered from recognised social station. Now the sort of free commerce, if we may so speak, between the Churches, which the removal of the restrictions would create, might be reasonably expected to raise the *status* of the clergy. Laity might feel and act somewhat differently towards a man of high attainments in Scottish orders, if they knew that his powers were becoming recognised elsewhere, and might lead to his migration southward. They might even occasionally make an effort to keep him.

But the discussion of this subject, in and by itself, has for the present, as we have intimated, become impossible. We pass on, therefore, to the consideration of the Scottish Liturgy. For our own part, earnestly desiring to see that Liturgy still preserved (either unaltered, or not altered for the worse), we must consider three separate classes of persons in connexion with this office, whom we may venture, without offence, to designate, as—1. The opponents; 2. The resigners; 3. The reformers.

1. At the head of the opponents, we must place the respected author of the first pamphlet upon our list. Those who are conscious of the long and unwearied services of the Dean of Edinburgh—who know how fitted he is, in so many ways, for the post he occupies; how well qualified for dealing with those upper classes, among whom no minister of religion in Scotland has so much influence—will gladly recognise his claim to speak on an occasion like the present. And the tone of his pamphlet may, almost without restriction, be safely pronounced to be unexceptionable. Most thoroughly do we agree with the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, that 'the spirit of the pamphlet must command respect, even where its arguments may fail to convince.'

But as we still remain among the unconvinced, we are bound to give our reasons for dissent. This is a task which must be attempted firmly and fearlessly. At the same time, we earnestly trust that our treatment of the arguments employed by Dean Ramsay may not be such as to militate against aught

that we have said indicative of personal respect. If any word that seems to fail in such respect should fall from our pen, we would apologise for it beforehand; for it is, most assuredly, not intended.

The first point we have to remark upon is this: It not unfrequently happens, that when two parties are contending, there exists in the mind of one of them (perhaps half unconsciously) some hidden *substratum*, so to speak, of a principle which so affects the entire argument as to render the avowed discussion useless. Thus, for example: Two politicians may debate on the much-vexed and really profound question, whether England did well and wisely, or otherwise, in entering upon war against France in 1793? But suppose that we discover, on looking into the arguments employed by one who condemns that war, that he starts, though not explicitly, from the principle that *all* war is wrong and unjustifiable. Obviously, such a one has prejudged the case, and the reasonings of his opponents are simply thrown away upon him. Or, to take an example from another department of thought: The Straussian school of unbelievers very commonly begin their attempt to disprove the historical character of the Holy Gospels by an elaborate disquisition upon the difficulties connected with the genealogies given respectively by S. Matthew and S. Luke. But when a sceptic of this sort is met with the searching arguments of Dr. Mill, or some other like-minded divine, it presently comes to light that his mental position is unchanged; he had already convinced himself that a narrative relating miracles *must* be untrue, whether historically correct or not in other respects. This principle was not, indeed, avowed; but in reality it lay, as a foundation, under the entire superstructure of argument and criticism.

In all such cases, it is most necessary, in the interest of truth and fairness, that the underlying principle be brought before the face of day. Is there any such principle underlying the controversy between the defenders and the opponents of the Scottish Liturgy?

We believe that there is, and that it ought, before all things, to be fairly and frankly brought to trial. The defender of the anti-Gallican war of 1793 has a right to ask his opponent if he belongs to a peace-at-all-price party, before he undertakes to argue. The anti-Straussian has a right to a distinct reply to the query, 'Do you, or do you not, believe in the possibility of miracles?' Because, if you do not, it is mere waste of time 'to discuss Gospel genealogies or various readings.' In like manner, we claim the right, respectfully but firmly, to demand of the opponents of the Scottish Liturgy, 'Do you, or do you

'not, believe that the Holy Eucharist possesses any sacrificial character?'

Because, if you do *not* believe it, there is no need whatever to adduce any lengthy train of reasoning against the Scottish Office. In that office, as in the Liturgies of S. Mark, of S. James, of S. Clement—as in the Gallican, the Roman, the American Liturgies—the oblation is prominently brought forward. Of course, if the doctrine of an oblation in this Holy Sacrament be false and unscriptural, the sooner every one of these offices disappears from the face of the earth, the better for the purity of Christian teaching.

It is somewhat singular, that, throughout the twenty-seven pages of the pamphlet before us, there is no mention whatever of such a question; no passing allusion to its existence. If we wish to learn what is held upon so momentous a point by the respected author of this important publication, we are compelled to look for it elsewhere.

But before we seek any solution of the problem what the Dean of Edinburgh may teach upon this subject, it will be well to cite the language of another very influential member of the same communion, the present Bishop of S. Andrews:—'There can be no question whatever that, in all the teaching of the Primitive Church, the notion of a *sacrifice* in the Eucharist holds a very prominent place; and it is equally certain that this notion is truly based upon the authority of Holy Scripture, and upon the practice of the Apostles themselves. It is sufficient to refer to that single passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 10), "We have an *Altar*," &c., with which we may compare the prophecy of Malachi (i. 11), "My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered in my Name, and a *pure offering*."¹

Most completely do we assent to the truth and correctness of this statement. The scriptural evidence might of course, as Bishop Wordsworth appears to intimate, be very much enlarged. 'There is,' remarks the late Bishop of Glasgow, Bishop Trower, 'more or less sacrificial language in the expressions used by our blessed Saviour in the institution of the Eucharist.'² And the Apostle, as the same writer observes, 'compares the Eucharist to the sacrifices of the law, and also to the sacrifices of the heathen.' (1 Cor. x. 16—21.)³

But after all, it may be urged, the doctrine seems, upon your own showing, to be an inference from Holy Scripture, rather

¹ A Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office: its History, Principles, and Advantages. By Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L., Bishop of S. Andrews, &c. Edinburgh: R. Grant & Son, 1859.

² Pastoral Letter (J. H. Parker), 1858, p. 26.

³ Ibid. p. 24.

than a plain dogmatic statement. True ; but we are compelled to ask again, as we have done before in a different connexion, whether an inference from Holy Scripture is a light matter. Do we sufficiently call to mind *to* whom it was said, and *by* whom it was said, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,' because the persons addressed had failed to perceive the proper inference deducible from certain solemn words recorded by Moses in the Book of Exodus?

Now, unless we misunderstand Dean Ramsay, he would deny the justice of the remarks just cited by us from the writings of these two prelates. We gather thus much from a sermon published by him in 1858.¹ And as, in the preface to the second edition of that sermon, it is expressly stated that the appeal is to be to Holy Scripture only, we wish, before proceeding any further, to enter upon a slight examination of the value of that challenge.

We take up our Bible, and aver most seriously that *we* do read therein (with Bishops Wordsworth and Trower) the doctrine of a sacrificial character pertaining to the Holy Eucharist. To us it seems to be expressed as plainly, to say the very least, as the doctrine of the Personality of the Holy Spirit. Thus, for example, here is a definite prediction made by the prophet Malachi. It must have some meaning. Has it been fulfilled or not?

Now, not pretending to be infallible interpreters of the Bible, we own ourselves compelled in this matter to have recourse to commentators. The Dean of Edinburgh (whom we take as the most influential and argumentative of those opponents of the office who have treated the subject at any length) declares [*the italics are his*] that 'any reliance upon writings of Fathers for 'building up an Eucharistic theory, *external* to Holy Scripture, 'or *independent* of Scripture, must seem a very hopeless task.'² But we are not at present aiming at anything either external to, or independent of, Holy Scripture: we are merely inquiring into the meaning of a particular text, asking whether a given prophecy has been fulfilled or not. And we must simply proceed as we did with respect to this very question some twelve months since. We turn, for example, to the well-known commentary of the Rev. Thomas Scott, and find that he simply passes over the passage *sicco pede*. We betake ourselves to a far more learned commentator, Joseph Mede, and we read as follows:—

'This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once, and that in the oldest and purest time of the Church, a text of

¹ The Scripture Doctrine of the Eucharist. Edinburgh: Grant & Son, 1858.

² Preface to the second edition of the above sermon.

eminent note, and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers, as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian Sacrifice or solemn worship in the Eucharist, taught by our blessed Saviour unto His disciples, to be observed of all that should believe in His Name: and this so generally and grantedly, as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learned thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles. . . . For in the age immediately succeeding them, it being the second hundred of years after Christ, we find it alleged to this purpose by Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the pillars of that age; the former of them flourishing within little more than thirty years after the death of S. John; and the latter a disciple of Polycarp, S. John's scholar. In the age following, or third *seculum*, it is alleged by Tertullian, Zeno Veronensis, and Cyprian; in the fourth *seculum*, by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Hierome, and Augustine; and in the after ages by whom not? Nor is it alleged by them as some singular opinion, or private conceit of their own, but as the received tradition of the Church: whence in some Liturgies (as that of the Church of Alexandria, commonly called the Liturgy of St. Mark) it is inserted into the Hymn, or Preface, which begins Ἀληθῶς ἀξιὸν ἐστὶ καὶ δίκαιον—"It is truly meet and right;" the conclusion of the hymn or laud there being, "Giving thanks, we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this reasonable and unbloody service, even that which all nations, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offer unto Thee; for Thy Name shall be great among all nations: and in every place incense is offered unto Thy Holy Name, and sacrifice and oblation."

Here then is, in our judgment, a primary reason for maintaining the Scottish Liturgy. It may be quite possible that, in some respects, the English Office has the advantage. But forasmuch as the Scotch brings out forcibly a deeply important element which is but faintly visible in the English Liturgy, we hope and trust that so valuable a testimony to a great truth, on the part of a sister communion, may not perish.

Is this language disloyal? If so, the charge must not be made against us peculiarly. It lies against any English divines who, like the saintly Bishop Wilson, have been accustomed to employ private prayers like those contained in the Scotch rite, when they were engaged in the celebration of Holy Communion. It lies against Bishop Horsley, who (in often-quoted words) declared his conviction that the Scotch Office was more conformable to the primitive models, and more edifying, than the English. It lies against Mr. Freeman, who avows that 'the revised Eucharistic Office of the English Church . . . has confessedly laboured under a certain faintness as to the ritual expression of her mind and doctrine. Her real mind in these respects has need to be written yet more legibly.'¹ It lies against the Bishop of S. Andrews, who says of the Scotch Office:—"It follows far more closely the model of the ancient Liturgies. It exhibits far more clearly the first great feature of the Institution, viz. the *act of Sacrifice*."² We need hardly

¹ Principles of Divine Service. Introduct. to Part II. pp. 193, 213.

² Plain Tract, &c. p. 17.

add, that to say that a given document brings out a particular feature into stronger relief than another document, does in nowise imply anything like contradiction between the two. Indeed, it is no more than we affirm respecting the Holy Gospels themselves. Who would deny that the Gospel of S. John sets forth the divinity of our Lord more fully than that of S. Mark? while, at the same time, who (but except some heretic, such as an Arian or Socinian) would maintain that the two Evangelists were at variance?

Any single testimony to a revealed truth is a precious thing, more particularly a testimony embalmed in the highest act of Christian worship. Any single link with distant times and other Churches is likewise very precious. Even Mede was reproved by a still greater theologian than himself—namely, Bishop Pearson—for employing language that seemed likely to endanger the strength of our connexion with primitive times; and we should like, on the present occasion, to ask our readers to peruse with care a brief extract from this *concio* of Pearson, as translated and commented upon by one of the very first divines of our own age, the late lamented Dr. Mill, in a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge:—

‘ Let us not consider it a slight matter which is thus proposed for our choice; and let us particularly not think it a point of small moment, even for our spiritual condition, being intelligent men and scholars, whether we are among those who reverence, or among those who vilify the Church of Apostolical times; *for to these, and to no later ones, are those ideas and practices clearly traced, which are now marked for abhorrence and rejection.* And I would prefer, finally, expressing this in the words, only recently discovered, of a great prelate of our Church, one whom it has not yet become usual in this University, which he adorned, to consider as a favourer of Roman views and practices. Speaking in a learned language to the clergy, of certain interpretations of prophecy then put forth, and now again proposed with greater pertinacity than ever, he says in conclusion:—“ This I say, that we should not think so ill of the promise of Jesus Christ, so ill of the men of Apostolic times, without whom we should not have the benefit even of the Holy Scriptures, and of all the other heroes of the primitive Church—as to preach a general apostasy of the Church, so disgraceful, so idolatrous: which, if it be true, infected and defiled all the assemblies of Christians, not only from the dissolution of the Roman Empire, but from the very infancy of the Church. For if we cut off all intercession of angels and saints for us living on earth, and striving with the host of evil spirits—if we acknowledge no power at all before the throne of God, of the martyrs who poured forth their lives for Christ—if all those who venerated their remains are by us rejected, scouted, and branded as idolaters . . . *what that Church may be with which we can hold communion I am altogether ignorant.* I know, indeed, what, among the men of these degenerate times, is the face of the Churches, and what a spirit is stirred in all, when the seamless coat of Christ has been rent asunder. But when we have discussed and ventilated all points, to those times we must have recourse—to those, I say, which knew the Apostles and the disciples of Apostles—which not only professed the Christian religion, but extended it both by purity of life and by the shedding of blood. . . . If that religion which sent the best part of the world under the yoke of Christ

was itself apostatical and idolatrous, where shall that appear which is Christian, catholic, and apostolical?

'So far Bishop Pearson (whose words, though primarily directed against the censors of the Church's veneration for departed saints, are no less conclusive against those who decry her Eucharistic Sacrifice). May we, like him, have our fellowship with those to whom the Apostles communicated what they had heard and seen, well assured that this is the true fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.'¹

Sit anima mea cum sanctis is, indeed, a most natural, as well hallowed, aspiration. It is possible to take part, even indirectly, in the abolition of what may prove to have been a providential witness to truth, without running the chance of aiding the spread of sentiments of a very different nature? May it not be found that those who prepare for battle against the doctrine of any sacrifice on the altar are unconsciously forging weapons against the doctrine of the Sacrifice upon the Cross?

To come forward and avow that this office ought to be abolished, because it involves the doctrine of an external oblation in the Eucharist, is, without doubt, a straightforward and intelligible course. But the adoption of such a course would involve the rejection and overthrow of the great bulk, not merely of Scottish, but likewise of English, theology.

The eminent person whose course of argument we mainly follow refers, in his recent pamphlet, to only three divines who have written upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist; namely, Hooker, Waterland, and Jeremy Taylor. The mistakes into which Hooker fell, in ignoring the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, have been pointed out by Mr. Freeman; and his language had been censured at an earlier period (if we remember aright) by Waterland. Waterland himself is called by the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Hook, 'a judicious divine, who 'has treated fully of this divine ordinance, and has taken of it, 'perhaps, the lowest view which is consistent with orthodoxy.'² Yet even Waterland declares, 'that the Sacrament of the 'Eucharist, in whole or in part, in a sense proper or improper, 'is a sacrifice of the Christian Church, is a point agreed upon 'among all knowing and sober divines, Popish, Lutheran, or 'Reformed.'³ Of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, it must be admitted that he is a very inconsistent writer. But if we may, with Dean Ellicott, of Exeter, look upon Taylor's 'Life of Christ' as his greatest work; if, as we believe, his innermost self comes

¹ Mill on the 'Nature of Christianity,' Sermon i. pp. 51—53. The words of Pearson are from his fourth *Concio ad Clerum*. Minor works; Ed. Churton, tom. ii. p. 54.

² The Eucharist a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. A Sermon preached at Birch Church, on the 5th of July, 1846. London: Rivingtons, 1847.

³ Cited by Dr. Hook in the above sermon, p. 13.

out more strongly in these devotional than in his controversial writings, then it must be said that Taylor has employed in 'his greatest work' the strongest language respecting the Eucharistic Sacrifice of any English divine, stronger than that of Hammond, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Bull, Poyntet, Hickes, John Johnson, and the other supporters of the doctrine. Most remarkable is it, as an indication of Bishop Taylor's truest mind, that when Parliament, during the Rebellion, forbade the use of the English Prayer-Book, Taylor drew up a Liturgy which brought out, in explicit form, the doctrine of the Sacrifice.

And now we come to a topic which demands, in the present day, very earnest and peculiar consideration. And if these pages should chance to meet the eye of any who differ from our views, we would respectfully beg their attention to this particular subject, even if they read no other portion of this article.

The existence of a sacrificial element in the Holy Eucharist either is a revealed truth or it is not. If we assert that it is not, then we condemn ancient fathers, ancient Liturgies, and the great body of Anglican divines, both in England and Scotland, who have asserted that it is. But if it *be* a revealed truth, then it is highly probable that, over and above its own special worth, it may fill some particular place in the economy of the faith, in such wise that its denial may endanger our grasp of other truths. One truth is very often the safeguard of another. For example, the ministry of angels is in itself a revelation eminently sublime, elevating, and consoling; but besides its intrinsic value, it is one of the greatest possible safeguards against the danger of Pantheism. He who has realized to himself the nature of the offices intrusted to S. Michael and S. Gabriel, is not likely to fall into the heresy of regarding their Lord and Creator as a mere abstraction, an impersonal *anima mundi*, working by laws over which He has no control.

Now, *the* assault of rationalism in our day is directed against the doctrine of the Atonement of the Sacrifice on the Cross. May it not prove, as this controversy with rationalism proceeds, *that the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Altar is the appointed safeguard of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Cross?* We submit this question to the earnest consideration of thoughtful men, and proceed to supply a few aids towards the formation of an opinion respecting it.

The author of a widely-circulated edition of the Greek Testament, Dean Alford, appears to us to take very special pains to ignore or evade the natural inference in favour of the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, deducible from such passages

as 1 Cor. x. 16—21: and the fact that such a doctrine was embodied in every one of the ancient Liturgies, without exception, would be probably treated by the same commentator as a matter of the slightest possible moment. True; but then it must be remembered that Canon Stanley¹ claims Dean Alford as a witness in favour of that very imperfect view (to use the mildest language) of the Atonement which has been promulgated by Professor Jowett.

Dr. Arnold, relying upon classic usage (a most insufficient guide to the meaning of Hellenistic Greek), expressed the greatest contempt for the argument for a sacrificial element in the Holy Eucharist derived from the use of the term *ποιεῖν* by S. Luke and S. Paul.² Yes; but then Dr. Arnold expressed contempt for a good many things besides. He rejected a great part of the Book of Daniel; he told Mr. F. Newman that he regarded the history of Joseph as a beautiful poem; and his view of the Holy Communion was such as to justify his son, in the tale of 'Oakfield,' representing two young laymen as doing well to partake of that most sacred rite without the aid or presence of any priest whatever.

Dr. Mill has left us a work which, though unfinished, is probably the most profound and learned reply to Strauss which exists in any language. True; but we have seen in the passage already cited how firmly Dr. Mill upheld the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Of all the Lutheran theologians of our time, none has more energetically, or in a more pious and reverent spirit, contended against neology than Hengstenberg. True; but then Hengstenberg is one of the leaders of a movement among German Protestants which aims at restoring the Holy Communion to its ancient place, as the main part and centre of Divine Service, and bringing prominently forward its sacrificial character. This movement is supported by the illustrious names of Kahnis, Kliefoth, Höfling, Sartorius, Harnack, Löhe, Buchmann, and others. High as was the view of Martin Luther respecting the supernatural and supra-local presence of Christ's body in this His chief sacrament, these Lutheran divines just named appear to go higher still. What would they not give to have an office

¹ Note appended to 'Freedom and Labour.' Two Sermons. (J. H. and Jas. Parker, 1860.) We do not pretend to decide upon the justice or injustice of Dr. Stanley's claim.

² S. Luke xxix. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24. Not only does *ποιεῖν* mean, *to sacrifice*, in more than thirty places of the Septuagint, but it seems natural sense in S. Matt. xxvi. 18.—'I will offer the passover at thy house with my disciples.' The expression, 'eat the passover,' in the parallel passages of S. Mark and S. Luke, in nowise militates against this interpretation, inasmuch as the partaking is an essential part of all true and legitimate sacrifice.

like the Scottish! How would they cling to it if it were once in their possession!

More than twenty years since an author of considerable name wrote as follows:—‘But as that deliverance [of Israel from Egypt] was accompanied with a sacrificial act, and by a sacrificial act accomplished—and yet in this Passover the act was perpetually renewed—because in this way the nation understood that by sacrifice it subsisted and consisted, and because by such a renewal its members realized the permanent and living character of the good that had been bestowed upon them, so it is here. The sacrifice of Christ is that with which alone God can be satisfied, and in the sight of which alone He can contemplate our race; it is, therefore, the only meeting point of communion with Him: but this communion being established, it must be *by presenting the finished sacrifice before God that we both bear witness what our position is, and realize the glory of it.*’¹

The present Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Thomson, is one of the most distinguished defenders of the sacrificial character of the one great Atonement, that can never be repeated, once for all made upon the cross. It is highly significant that, in his excellent essay upon the ‘Death of Christ,’ Bishop Thomson is led to appeal to the history of the institution of the Holy Eucharist as a proof of the sacrifice involved in our Lord’s death. ‘It cannot be denied (we might almost say that, before Mr. Jowett, it never was denied) that the words of the institution of the Lord’s Supper speak most distinctly of a sacrifice.’ Another writer, Mr. Heygate, seems to us to have been only drawing out, by anticipation, the natural conclusion deducible from Dr. Thomson’s arguments, when he wrote the chapter in his ‘Catholic Antidotes,’ entitled, ‘The Eucharistic Sacrifice the Appointed Witness of the Atonement.’

The first signal of a serious attack upon the doctrine of the Atonement by any divine of the English Church was given by Professor Jowett, in his essay upon the subject. It is by no means easy to catch the precise purport of a writer so misty, and so unversed in the use of theological terms, as the Professor of Greek at Oxford. But there did *seem* to be contained in the first edition of that essay a hint that it was consistent enough in one who held and taught the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, to proclaim at the same time the Sacrifice upon the Cross; but that it was *not* consistent to drop all

¹ Kingdom of Christ; part ii. chap. iv. sec. 4. Even so lately as last year, Mr. Maurice has spoken of the connexion between the Eucharist and the Atonement in terms not discordant with the above passage.

mention of the former, and still ask for credence in the latter. This passage has, we believe, been withdrawn from the second edition of Mr. Jowett's work on the Epistles. But a hint, once given, is often valuable. In the present instance, we feel deeply grateful for a suggestion which we cannot but suspect to contain the germ of a deep truth; and we commend it to thoughtful meditation, on the part of those who reflect at all upon such subjects.

The Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Episcopal Church in America may have respectively their own faults and shortcomings; but neither of these communions has ever yet been charged with fostering rationalism within their pale, as it may now, alas! be charged against the Church of England. Now, the Scottish Church, and its daughter the American Church, have both retained in their Liturgies a distinct oblation; but the English Church has not retained it.

The publication of 'Essays and Reviews' has produced a very considerable effect upon the minds of many earnest members of what is commonly called the Evangelical party. The excellent persons to whom we refer have been much struck with two things—Firstly, the appearance of such a book has convinced them that there are worse things in the world than Tractarianism; and, secondly, they have frankly admitted that writers more or less connected with the High-Church school have done prompt and vigorous service against the obnoxious teaching. Our contemporary, the *Record*, if we remember rightly, most cordially recognised the merit of Dr. Pusey's letter concerning 'Essays and Reviews' in the *Guardian*; Dr. Moberly's championship in the cause was gladly welcomed; and a reprint from the pages of this Review received, perhaps, higher praise from the *St. James's Chronicle* than from any quarter. Is it too much to hope for a still more complete *rapprochement*? May not, at least, the sons of some who are now eager for the abolition of the office of which we are treating live to thank those who contended for it; and the *Future of the Scottish Liturgy* be its recognition, not merely as a link with the past, but also as a most valuable safeguard against the special dangers of the coming age?

Conscientiously believing that the Scotch Office may prove to be all this, we need hardly say that we are not in a position to listen with thoroughly consentient ears to appeals made in the interest of peace and unity, such as stand upon the dedication page, and confront us again in the latest page of this pamphlet. Not, we trust, that we are insensible to the value of these great and signal blessings. No, indeed; far from it: they carry with them their own recommendation; they are stamped

with the approval of Him who bequeathed to His chosen ones a peace that is not of earth, who prayed for all who should believe in Him, that they might be one. But these gifts, precious as they are, do not and cannot stand alone. The Divine Founder of the Church, the Prince of peace, and Father of union, announced Himself likewise as the Truth; declared most emphatically that He was born and came into the world that He might bear witness unto the truth. And in this spirit does our Church pray, 'that all who profess and call 'themselves Christians may be led into *the way of truth*, and 'hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in 'righteousness of life;' or, again, 'that all they that do confess 'Thy holy Name may agree *in the truth* of Thy holy Word, and 'live in unity and godly love.' Both in her daily prayer and in her Communion Office, is the self-same order preserved: *truth* first, unity and peace afterwards. Now, if the Scottish Liturgy bear witness to a neglected truth, of especial moment at this time, those who would fain save that office from abolition may fairly claim to stand upon considerations which take precedence even of desires for peace and love.

We have observed that the pamphlet before us does not contain a single syllable on the important topic to which we have been mainly referring in the last ten pages. But while we think it most necessary to discuss that subject, from a conviction that it underlies the entire controversy, it would be unfair in us to pass by the serious objection to the office which Dean Ramsay has embodied in his pamphlet.

His objection is, that the Scottish Liturgy, in company with that of S. James, S. Mark, S. Clement, and S. Chrysostom, is, in one respect, simply *unscriptural*. It is difficult, assuredly, to overrate either the boldness or the seriousness of such a charge. In avowing it, we believe that the Dean of Edinburgh stands absolutely alone and unsupported by any single great divine of the primitive Church, of the English Church, of the Eastern Churches. Nor do we for a moment imagine that his view would be countenanced by any of the better anti-rationalistic Lutheran divines, such as Kahnis or Hengstenberg. From one quarter, and one only, is he likely to gain support; and that is from a second-rate class of Roman Catholic divines, such as Turrecremàta. Under these circumstances, we cannot be surprised at the following remarks of the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*:—

'If there is one thing in it which we regret, it is that the Dean has gone into the question as to the doctrinal merits of the Scottish Office, and by making a comparison between it and the English Office, to the disparagement of the

former, has thereby, we are apprehensive, weakened the cause he has taken in hand. There is, at the present moment, many a Scottish priest willing to surrender the Scottish Office, on the ground that it is inexpedient to retain it, in the face of the difficulties created by its use under the constant and increasing intercourse between England and Scotland, who would rather face those difficulties multiplied a hundred-fold, than consent to abandon the Office on the plea that it was one whit less Scriptural than the English.'

The appeal of the Dean of Edinburgh is to Holy Scripture. Thus far, of course, he does *not* stand alone. We will just refer to one other writer who appeals to the same standard. No one has done this in a more marked manner than that very distinguished liturgical scholar, Mr. W. Palmer:—'*Guided by Scripture, she [the Church] establishes only those truths which Scripture reveals, and leaves the subject in that mystery with which God, for His wise purposes, has invested it.*'¹ Such is Mr. Palmer's language, and no liturgist has more ably or zealously defended the Communion Office of the English Church. And what is the judgment of this student of Scripture and the Liturgies respecting that invocation of the Holy Spirit which Dean Ramsay thinks so unscriptural? '*No one,*' says Mr. Palmer, '*can pretend to deny that it is perfectly orthodox, and highly laudable.*'²

S. Matthew and S. Mark both inform us that our Lord blessed the bread (εὐλογήσας). S. Luke and S. Paul employ a different, and, perhaps, even more emphatic, term (εὐχαριστήσας). We say more emphatic, for few will be found to maintain that the 'giving thanks' of our authorized version conveys the full force of this term. In any case, it cannot be considered to mean less, for all four of the inspired writers apply this latter term to the cup; and no one, that we ever heard of, ever pretended that the blessing imparted to the one element in any wise fell short of that imparted to the other. The reason for the variety of the expressions (as Canon Wordsworth very justly remarks on S. Matth. xxvi. 28) 'seems to be, that He 'designed to afford the *full* sense of the words by paraphrasing 'them in different ways.' And far as we are from accepting Dean Alford as a guide in these questions, we have no difference with him when, in his note upon this same passage, he writes: 'εὐλογήσας and εὐχαριστήσας amount to the same 'in practice. . . . εὐλογήσας must be construed transitively—'ἄρτον is governed by all four verbs, λαβὼν, εὐλογήσας, ἔκλασε, ἔδιδου. From this *giving of thanks for*, and *blessing the* 'offering, the Holy Communion has been from the earliest 'times also called εὐχαριστία.' [Italics as in original.] For proof of the active force of εὐλογέω, Dr. Alford rightly refers

¹ Treatise on the Church, vol. ii.

² Ancient Liturgies, vol. ii.

to a passage in many ways important, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (x. 16), 'The cup of blessing which we bless,' &c.

It is part of the immeasurable depth and fulness of Holy Writ, that even single words very frequently imply some important principle; nay, even a whole system of doctrine or of practice. Such terms as *Only-begotten*, *repentance*, *justified*, *proceeding from*, *enlightened*, and numbers more, are well-nigh a theology in themselves. And thus, in the instance before us, the Church throughout the world has understood the expressions, *εὐλογήσας*, *εὐχαριστήσας*, to involve the idea of a prayer of blessing on the elements. Almost everywhere does it seem to have been held of old, that the mere recitation of our Lord's solemn words of institution is insufficient without some such prayer. Even Presbyterianism has recognised thus much:—
'The Directory for the worship of God in the Established Church of Scotland directs, that the minister shall earnestly pray to God, the Father of all mercies, to vouchsafe His gracious presence and the effectual working of His Spirit in us, and so to sanctify these elements of bread and wine, and bless His own ordinance, that we may receive by faith the body and blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us.'¹ The English Church has such a prayer in the words immediately preceding the rite of institution—'Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.'

Now, how is all this profound question of the *blessing* (a feature declared by many sound theologians to be *essential* to the sacred Office) treated in the pamphlet before us? In no spirit of invidiousness or of disrespect, but simply that we may look the matter fairly in the face, it will be well to place the passage from the Epistle to the Corinthians, which Dean Ramsay cites, side by side with his paraphrase of it:—

1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

'For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread: and when He had given thanks, He

Paraphrase by the Dean of Edinburgh.

'In other words, St. Paul, as a minister of Jesus Christ, was directed to do as Jesus had done, the night in which He was betrayed—viz. to break the bread and take the cup, and at

¹ A friend in Scotland, writing to us, called our attention to this order of the Presbyterian Directory. Since this letter reached us, we observe that the order has been used in a 'Northern Layman's Plea' (a very excellent one) for the Office in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* for last April. Not having the Directory at hand, we have borrowed from this last-named letter.

brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.'

once deliver it to the communicants: nay, the two acts seem to go together. He broke the bread, and said, "Take, eat;" He took the cup, saying, "This cup is the new testament." [Italics as in original.]

This is surely, for one who refers to Holy Scripture only, a very daring paraphrase. It omits what the Apostle does say; it inserts that which he does not say. It omits all allusion to the term *εὐχαριστήσας*, on the full sense and import of which the question between us mainly hinges, and it inserts, in italics, the words *at once*, which form no part whatever of the inspired record. The omission we would venture to supply by paraphrasing this word *εὐχαριστήσας* into *having uttered a prayer of benediction*; that is to say, having done what is done in the *English* Office, but more emphatically and distinctly in the *Scottish*. The Dean of Edinburgh appears to think this portion of the service of little or no moment. In such a view, he has with him some of the schoolmen and later Roman Catholic divines. But the prince of the schoolmen, Aquinas, is against him; and we believe that the other theory of consecration is of late date, and not easily reconciled with the tenor of Holy Scripture, any more than it is with the language of the early Fathers and the Liturgies.

And now to come to the insertion *at once*. We have already admitted the lawfulness of inference from Holy Scripture. But it must be remarked, that of all inferences chronological ones are often the most delicate and difficult, and the very last on which a cautious student of Scripture would wish to dogmatize. Nothing is more clear than that the holy Evangelists, in many instances, present us with a mere sketch and outline of what occurred, and that the *primâ facie* inference of an immediate sequence would again and again be utterly incorrect. To refer to only the latter events of 'the Life that was manifested.' Who could possibly gather from the first three Gospels that any important event tending to hasten the consummation had occurred before the last journey to Jerusalem? But the sequence of the events narrated by S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, is *not* continuous: one does not follow *at once* upon the other; there intervened the wonderful recalling to life of Lazarus, an event not only important as one of our Lord's very greatest miracles, but most closely interwoven with the entire framework of the plots against His life. Again, who would doubt, in reading S. Matthew xxvi. 29, 30, with the parallel passages in S. Mark and

S. Luke, that the singing of the hymn and departure to the Mount of Olives followed *at once* upon the conclusion of the new and solemn ordinance. Yet so far is this from being the case, that the discourse then uttered by our Lord is sufficient to occupy no less than four chapters, or nearly a sixth part of S. John's Gospel. If the Dean of Edinburgh is justified in dogmatically asserting that there was no interval whatever between the consecration and the delivery of the consecrated elements to the communicants, others may as dogmatically assert that the whole action was continuous, that there was no interval between the consecration of the bread and that of the cup. Now, we certainly feel inclined to agree with those who believe that the whole of that sacred action *was* continuous. But even here we are forced to pause and consider the danger of being too confident in our chronological inferences. Before we unhesitatingly assert that the consecration and delivery of the chalice followed *at once* upon that of the prior substance, we have to consider that one of the profoundest students of Scripture of our time, Mr. Greswell, thinks otherwise, and that Aquinas has anticipated Mr. Greswell in taking this view.

But let us, for argument's sake, assume that Dean Ramsay's inference is perfectly correct. Even then, we maintain that his argument would prove too much. If the Church is tied down to a rigid and exact uniformity of order, according to the arrangement which seems to be set forth in *the letter* of the Gospels and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, then that order stands as follows:—

1. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the bread (εὐλογήσας, εὐχαριστήσας).

2. Breaking of the same (ἔκλασε).

3. Delivery (ἐδίδου, ἔδωκεν) to the communicants.

4. Words of institution for prior part of the rite (recorded in all four narratives).

5. Additional words indicating a commemorative and (apparently) sacrificial character (S. Luke and S. Paul).

Then, either immediately, or (as some think) after an interval:¹—

6. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the cup.

7. Delivery of the same.

8. Words of institution (recorded in all four accounts).

¹ As we have just remarked, Aquinas, Mr. Williams, Mr. Greswell, and others, believe in the intervention of certain acts and words between the two parts, Mr. Greswell inserts S. Mark xxvi. 21—25; S. Mark xiv. 18—21; S. Luke xxii. 21—23; S. John xiii. 18—38; and S. Luke xxii. 24—38. Powerful and ingenious arguments for unbroken sequence are employed by Estius and others.

brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.

once deliver it to the communicants: nay, the two acts seem to go together. He broke the bread, and said, "Take, eat;" He took the cup, saying, "This cup is the new testament." [Italics as in original.]

This is surely, for one who refers to Holy Scripture only, a very daring paraphrase. It omits what the Apostle does say; it inserts that which he does not say. It omits all allusion to the term *εὐχαριστήσας*, on the full sense and import of which the question between us mainly hinges, and it inserts, in italics, the words *at once*, which form no part whatever of the inspired record. The omission we would venture to supply by paraphrasing this word *εὐχαριστήσας* into *having uttered a prayer of benediction*; that is to say, having done what is done in the *English* Office, but more emphatically and distinctly in the *Scottish*. The Dean of Edinburgh appears to think this portion of the service of little or no moment. In such a view, he has with him some of the schoolmen and later Roman Catholic divines. But the prince of the schoolmen, Aquinas, is against him; and we believe that the other theory of consecration is of late date, and not easily reconciled with the tenor of Holy Scripture, any more than it is with the language of the early Fathers and the Liturgies.

And now to come to the insertion *at once*. We have already admitted the lawfulness of inference from Holy Scripture. But it must be remarked, that of all inferences chronological ones are often the most delicate and difficult, and the very last on which a cautious student of Scripture would wish to dogmatize. Nothing is more clear than that the holy Evangelists, in many instances, present us with a mere sketch and outline of what occurred, and that the *primâ facie* inference of an immediate sequence would again and again be utterly incorrect. To refer to only the latter events of 'the Life that was manifested.' Who could possibly gather from the first three Gospels that any important event tending to hasten the consummation had occurred before the last journey to Jerusalem? But the sequence of the events narrated by S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, is *not* continuous: one does not follow *at once* upon the other; there intervened the wonderful recalling to life of Lazarus, an event not only important as one of our Lord's very greatest miracles, but most closely interwoven with the entire framework of the plots against His life. Again, who would doubt, in reading S. Matthew xxvi. 29, 30, with the parallel passages in S. Mark and

S. Luke, that the singing of the hymn and departure to the Mount of Olives followed *at once* upon the conclusion of the new and solemn ordinance. Yet so far is this from being the case, that the discourse then uttered by our Lord is sufficient to occupy no less than four chapters, or nearly a sixth part of S. John's Gospel. If the Dean of Edinburgh is justified in dogmatically asserting that there was no interval whatever between the consecration and the delivery of the consecrated elements to the communicants, others may as dogmatically assert that the whole action was continuous, that there was no interval between the consecration of the bread and that of the cup. Now, we certainly feel inclined to agree with those who believe that the whole of that sacred action *was* continuous. But even here we are forced to pause and consider the danger of being too confident in our chronological inferences. Before we unhesitatingly assert that the consecration and delivery of the chalice followed *at once* upon that of the prior substance, we have to consider that one of the profoundest students of Scripture of our time, Mr. Greswell, thinks otherwise, and that Aquinas has anticipated Mr. Greswell in taking this view.

But let us, for argument's sake, assume that Dean Ramsay's inference is perfectly correct. Even then, we maintain that his argument would prove too much. If the Church is tied down to a rigid and exact uniformity of order, according to the arrangement which seems to be set forth in *the letter* of the Gospels and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, then that order stands as follows:—

1. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the bread (εὐλογήσας, εὐχαριστήσας).

2. Breaking of the same (ἐκλάσσε).

3. Delivery (ἐδίδου, ἔδωκεν) to the communicants.

4. Words of institution for prior part of the rite (recorded in all four narratives).

5. Additional words indicating a commemorative and (apparently) sacrificial character (S. Luke and S. Paul).

Then, either immediately, or (as some think) after an interval:¹—

6. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the cup.

7. Delivery of the same.

8. Words of institution (recorded in all four accounts).

¹ As we have just remarked, Aquinas, Mr. Williams, Mr. Greswell, and others, believe in the intervention of certain acts and words between the two parts. Mr. Greswell inserts S. Mark xxvi. 21—25; S. Mark xiv. 18—21; S. Luke xxii. 21—23; S. John xiii. 18—38; and S. Luke xxii. 24—38. Powerful and ingenious arguments for unbroken sequence are employed by Estius and others.

brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.'

once deliver it to the communicants: nay, the two acts seem to go together. He broke the bread, and said, "Take, eat;" He took the cup, saying, "This cup is the new testament." [Italics as in original.]

This is surely, for one who refers to Holy Scripture only, a very daring paraphrase. It omits what the Apostle does say; it inserts that which he does not say. It omits all allusion to the term *εὐχαριστήσας*, on the full sense and import of which the question between us mainly hinges, and it inserts, in italics, the words *at once*, which form no part whatever of the inspired record. The omission we would venture to supply by paraphrasing this word *εὐχαριστήσας* into *having uttered a prayer of benediction*; that is to say, having done what *is* done in the *English* Office, but more emphatically and distinctly in the *Scottish*. The Dean of Edinburgh *appears* to think this portion of the service of little or no moment. In such a view, he has with him some of the schoolmen and later Roman Catholic divines. But the prince of the schoolmen, Aquinas, is against him; and we believe that the other theory of consecration is of late date, and not easily reconciled with the tenor of Holy Scripture, any more than it is with the language of the early Fathers and the Liturgies.

And now to come to the insertion *at once*. We have already admitted the lawfulness of inference from Holy Scripture. But it must be remarked, that of all inferences chronological ones are often the most delicate and difficult, and the very last on which a cautious student of Scripture would wish to dogmatize. Nothing is more clear than that the holy Evangelists, in many instances, present us with a mere sketch and outline of what occurred, and that the *primâ facie* inference of an immediate sequence would again and again be utterly incorrect. To refer to only the latter events of 'the Life that was manifested.' Who could possibly gather from the first three Gospels that any important event tending to hasten the consummation had occurred before the last journey to Jerusalem? But the sequence of the events narrated by S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, is *not* continuous: one does not follow *at once* upon the other; there intervened the wonderful recalling to life of Lazarus, an event not only important as one of our Lord's very greatest miracles, but most closely interwoven with the entire framework of the plots against His life. Again, who would doubt, in reading S. Matthew xxvi. 29, 30, with the parallel passages in S. Mark and

S. Luke, that the singing of the hymn and departure to the Mount of Olives followed *at once* upon the conclusion of the new and solemn ordinance. Yet so far is this from being the case, that the discourse then uttered by our Lord is sufficient to occupy no less than four chapters, or nearly a sixth part of S. John's Gospel. If the Dean of Edinburgh is justified in dogmatically asserting that there was no interval whatever between the consecration and the delivery of the consecrated elements to the communicants, others may as dogmatically assert that the whole action was continuous, that there was no interval between the consecration of the bread and that of the cup. Now, we certainly feel inclined to agree with those who believe that the whole of that sacred action *was* continuous. But even here we are forced to pause and consider the danger of being too confident in our chronological inferences. Before we unhesitatingly assert that the consecration and delivery of the chalice followed *at once* upon that of the prior substance, we have to consider that one of the profoundest students of Scripture of our time, Mr. Greswell, thinks otherwise, and that Aquinas has anticipated Mr. Greswell in taking this view.

But let us, for argument's sake, assume that Dean Ramsay's inference is perfectly correct. Even then, we maintain that his argument would prove too much. If the Church is tied down to a rigid and exact uniformity of order, according to the arrangement which seems to be set forth in the *letter* of the Gospels and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, then that order stands as follows:—

1. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the bread (εὐλογήσας, εὐχαριστήσας).

2. Breaking of the same (ἔκλασε).

3. Delivery (ἐδίδου, ἔδωκεν) to the communicants.

4. Words of institution for prior part of the rite (recorded in all four narratives).

5. Additional words indicating a commemorative and (apparently) sacrificial character (S. Luke and S. Paul).

Then, either immediately, or (as some think) after an interval:¹—

6. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the cup.

7. Delivery of the same.

8. Words of institution (recorded in all four accounts).

¹ As we have just remarked, Aquinas, Mr. Williams, Mr. Greswell, and others, believe in the intervention of certain acts and words between the two parts. Mr. Greswell inserts S. Mark xxvi. 21—25; S. Mark xiv. 18—21; S. Luke xxii. 21—23; S. John xiii. 18—38; and S. Luke xxii. 24—38. Powerful and ingenious arguments for unbroken sequence are employed by Estius and others.

9. Additional words resembling those applied to the prior part (S. Paul only).

We are quite unable to see how any Church in Christendom can be justified in attacking the arrangement of the Scottish and the Oriental Churches as unscriptural, without at the same time condemning itself. If the Church of Rome and the Church of England may with propriety (which we do not for a moment doubt) consecrate, by prayer and the recital of the words of institution, both elements *before* either the celebrant or the people partake, how can they, with any show of justice or of charity, blame those who place the prayer for a blessing after the recital of the words of institution. The Western arrangement, as such, may be preferable; our own judgment would be, with diffidence, in its favour. But this question of order seems to us a fairly open one; and *both* the Eastern and the Western Churches are unscriptural, or else neither.

In his pamphlet on the 'Present State of our Canon Law considered,' the Dean lays so much stress on the exactitude of sequence, as to intimate that *any* prayer, between the words of institution and delivery of that spiritual food to the communicants, is incorrect. This is saying, in other words, that there is no correct liturgy in all Christendom, saving and except the English. All the rest, American, Oriental, Roman, Scottish, are *so far* wrong, as every one of them have some prayer between. Surely this is the very height of intolerance.

But we are unable, for our own part, to see how the matter can rest there. If the Churches of different countries have no right to insert anything in one part of their liturgies, except what they find visibly and precisely laid down in Holy Scripture, what right have they to make insertions elsewhere? If they are rigidly bound to the letter of the Biblical narrative, this rule must not be employed as a Lesbian one, and only made to fit in parts. We must test the entire service by it; and what is in this case to become of the service? Take the English Office. The commandments must, of course, disappear. There is not the shadow of evidence that they formed any part of the primal Eucharist. Then, supposing that on general grounds we can account for the two next prayers, the Epistle and Gospel must be necessarily withdrawn; for as they were not in existence, they can have no possible warrant from the inspired records, as a part of the sacred Office. The Nicene Creed must, of course, follow; and, indeed, we hardly know what would remain.

The precise relation of the invocation to the words of institution is a point on which it must be frankly owned there are

two schools among the defenders of the Scottish and Oriental Liturgies. This is, however, no more than can be asserted with equal truth respecting the Roman Liturgy and the English Liturgy. It certainly cannot be on the grounds of perfect conformity among its advocates that the English Office can lay claim to supplant the Scottish. Our own view of the relation of the two parts of the Office, just referred to, would incline to the teaching of those who regard the words of institution, the oblation, and the invocation, as one great action, only carried on in consecutive portions, just because man is *compelled* to act *in time*; whereas God, the Holy Trinity, whose agency is thus sought, transcends all bounds of time, as well as of space, and can effect that at once which we mortals are obliged to ask for step by step.

The Dean of Edinburgh, however, appears to have a certain amount of objection to the appeal thus made to the third person of the Holy Trinity, seeing that the Sacrament itself is so especially that of the Son. His other objections may be more or less surprising; this one is simply astounding. We should have thought that if there was one truth more patent than another on the very surface of the New Testament, it was the wonderful intertwining (if we may use the term without irreverence) of the work of the Holy Spirit with that of the Son. Thus, for example, we know that the Son condescended to make Himself of no reputation, to take the form of a servant, and to be born of the Virgin Mary; He stooped to be baptized by his own humble forerunner; He willed to go into the wilderness and be tempted of the devil; He went about, of His own free choice, preaching the Gospel and working miracles; He offered Himself a spotless sacrifice upon the cross. It will scarcely, we presume, be disputed that the above statements are Scriptural. And yet each one of them is, by itself, the enunciation of only partial truth. That He may be born of the Virgin Mary, it is needed in the Divine economy that He should first be conceived of the Holy Ghost; when the Baptist pours on His brow the waters of Jordan, it is the Spirit of God who descends like a dove upon the Son; He goes up to the wilderness to be tempted, but He is led thither by the Spirit; the claim to proceed upon His work of healing body and soul is grounded on the fact, that the Spirit of the Lord is upon Him; and when He consummated His meritorious work upon Mount Calvary, He, '*through the eternal Spirit*, offered Himself without spot to God.' We cannot so much as mention the name of the Messiah, the Christ, without, by implication, referring to the work of the Spirit. For what do these words mean, but the Anointed? And '*the Spirit of the Lord hath anointed Me:*

He was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power.' It is in accordance with the whole analogy of Scripture, in the highest degree probable, that when our Lord blessed His creatures of bread and wine, He *did* specially invoke the Holy Spirit. Of course, we entirely agree with Mr. Palmer, that such express mention of the third person of the Holy Trinity is not essential. But so far as we know, it has been reserved for a divine of the nineteenth century to make the first attack upon this particular feature of the Eastern Liturgies; and we really trust that this first attack will also be the last. That the 'invocation should *supersede* the consecration,' to use the words of this pamphlet, is impossible, and was never imagined.¹

Are Dean Ramsay's objections to the Scottish Office finished? Alas! no; there remains one more, which lies still deeper than any of those that have preceded. It must be stated in his own words —

'Surely bread and wine can only be called the Body and Blood of Christ in their relation to the communicants? Many persons do really consider it a somewhat dangerous assimilation to the doctrine of transubstantiation to pray that the bread and wine may become *in themselves* and *per se* the Body and Blood of Christ. We can never hold them, in a sense purely subjective, to have that character.'

The concluding sentence, construed *ad literam*, might somewhat perplex us. But its meaning, when it is taken with the context, is sufficiently clear. Either for *subjective* we must read *objective*, or else we must insert the words 'otherwise than' before 'purely subjective.' The former emendation is the less harsh and the one that we may venture to adopt.

Is it, then, disrespectful, is it uncharitable, to understand the drift of the pamphlet before us to be as follows:—The 'Scripture doctrine of the Holy Eucharist' was set forth in a sermon preached in S. John's Church, Edinburgh, on January 10th, 1856, and seems to contain the key-note to the Dean's views of exhaustive truth, and of his desire for the abolition of the Scottish Office.

Now if the teaching of that sermon be not merely tolerable (being, as it is, most decidedly above that of the Zuinglian school), but likewise the only one that is to *be* tolerated, then indeed

¹ 'The sense of the Oriental Church may be thus expressed: the bread and wine offered on the altar are transmuted into the Body and Blood of Christ by the words of institution *and* by the invocation by the Church of the Holy Ghost.' These words of Dr. Neale have been approved of by some of the highest authorities in the Russian Church. We quote them from his 'Earnest Plea for the Retention of the Scotch Liturgy.' It is right to say, that this powerful pamphlet has only just reached us. Consequently, any agreement between us and this eminent liturgical scholar is a really independent coincidence of thought.

is the desired conclusion quite irrefragable. But if anything higher than the view invented by Calvin¹ be tolerable, then the argument implied in this pamphlet seems to us to suggest one of the strongest possible reasons for the retention of the Scottish Office.

Should that Office be withdrawn, upon such grounds, it must, we conceive, imply a censure on the whole of the existing Scottish Bench. Directly or indirectly, the Bishops in Scotland have all sanctioned language which we cannot but think to be much more consonant to the Scottish Office than to that of Dean Ramsay's sermon. That language we subjoin in a note;² and meanwhile, on the subject of the Invocation, would quote the following remarks of the Bishop of S. Andrews:—

'But how, then, you may ask, are the words of this prayer to be explained? I answer, simply by a reference to our blessed Lord's own words. We pray that the Bread and Wine may "become," that is, *come to be*, what He Himself, in the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, said they *are*, viz. HIS BODY AND BLOOD. Surely, there can be nothing wrong in this. We all know that the Eucharist is a great *Sacrament* or *mystery*—that is, something altogether beyond our comprehension; and surely, in such a case, the very best and safest thing we can do, especially when we are at the height of the mystery—that is, in the act of consecration—I say the very best and safest thing we can do, is to keep as close as we can to our Lord's own words. How these words are to be understood is another matter, which applies to the interpretation of them where they occur in the Holy Gospels, exactly in the same manner and degree as it does to our Communion Office; and a person who is offended by them, or wishes to get rid of them out of our Communion Office, might with just as much reason object to them, and wish to get rid of them out of the New Testament: and you will remember what our blessed Lord says of such a wish: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels."—*Plain Tract*, p. 15.

If we knew of any production against the Office which had equal weight and importance with that of Dean Ramsay, we would have given it as prominent a position. Thus far we have only paid attention to the arguments adduced against the unscriptural character of the office; and we ask our readers, with their Bibles before them, to consider whether it is the Scottish Liturgy, or the objections to it, which are unscriptural. Is it unscriptural to recognise a sacrificial character in the Holy Eucharist? Is it unscriptural to believe that every single word employed in the narrative of so great an event should

¹ 'That doctrine, however Christian a face it may wear, was simply *invented by Calvin three hundred years ago*.—Freeman's 'Principles of Divine Service,' Introduction to Part II. p. 201.

² 'Instructed by Scripture and the Formularies of the Church, you will continue to teach that the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine become, in a mystery, the Body and Blood of Christ.'—Pastoral, signed by the Primus and five other Scottish Bishops, issued in May, 1858.

have due weight accorded to it? Is it unscriptural, and against the analogy of the faith, to believe that as the Holy Spirit was specially concerned in the Incarnation of the Son, even so, too, He may be specially concerned in bringing about the mystical presence of His body and blood? Is it unscriptural to believe that when the Apostle spoke of 'not discerning (*μὴ διακρίνων*) the Lord's body,' immediately after his account of the institution, he implied that It was, in some sense, objectively present, though the unworthy recipient might not be conscious of Its presence?

If all these questions are to be answered in the affirmative, then in a greater or less degree must be pronounced, at the same time, the condemnation of the Eastern, the American, and the Scottish Churches, for daring to employ liturgies which imply, with greater or less distinctness, replies in the negative.

But we, for our part, we hope reverently and in the fear of God, refuse to take part in any such proceeding.

II. Nothing that has thus far been said will, we presume, be thought to be alien from the province of a Review which undertakes to discuss theological and quasi-theological subjects, in connexion, not only with England, but with America, France, Ireland, Scotland, and Italy. But we have now arrived at that portion of our discussion which is more delicate, inasmuch as it may subject us to the charge of offering most unasked-for advice. Yet let it be remembered that no one is compelled to read what is here set down. Moreover, from more than one quarter, we have heard hopes expressed that so grave a question should find its place in our July number. And if our remarks should prove distasteful to many of whose approbation should be glad, it may well be doubted whether total silence would not be equally displeasing to a large proportion of Scottish Churchmen. They would not be pleased to see that matters, of which *they* think much, were totally uncared-for by the rest of Britain. The speech of Sir Geraint in 'Enid' is hardly courteous, even, in cases where it is true:

'Ye think the rustic cackle of your bourg
The murmur of the world! What is it to me?'

And *Edimbourg*, as the French call it, is not a rustic bourg; and there are others besides Scotchmen-born, who take interest in this or that feature of the varied life of the place. Some of those, who will perhaps blame us for interference, may themselves have had the opportunity of uttering their sentiments in Diocesan Synods, or will have such an opening in the forthcoming General Synod. But we, who have enjoyed

no such privilege, may be pardoned for thus conveying our opinions to such as care to know them. We are now concerned with those whom we have ventured to call Resigners; that is to say, those who, while assuring us that they do not object to the Scottish Liturgy, are yet prepared to vote for alterations in the Scottish Canons which are intended to eradicate it in a few years.

We begin with some general considerations. Let it be observed, that if there exist in the world of action at the present moment one sentiment more active and pervading than another, it is *the dread of mere majorities, as such*. We say *mere* majorities; for, of course, we do not intend anything so absurd as that majorities are not very often entirely in the right. But in such cases it will be found, for the most part, that they are not simply majorities of numbers, but contain in them elements of another character which give character and authority to their decisions.

In 1844, the late Mr. Daniel O'Connell was tried for sedition and convicted. A question, however, was reserved for the decision of the English judges touching the conformity to the letter of the law of the procedure connected with handing to the accused the list of witnesses. The judges divided; nine were in favour of the legality of the proceedings, six were against it. Why did barristers shake their heads and hint doubts as to the ultimate confirmation of what had been done? Because, although there was a majority half as large again as the minority, that minority comprised the name of Mr. Baron Parke, since raised to the peerage as Lord Wensleydale. The final appeal lay to the House of Lords; the Government (Sir Robert Peel was Premier) could easily have mustered supporters enough to confirm the view taken by the nine judges. But they shrank on a point of such nicety from trusting to a *mere majority*. At the request of the President of the Council, the matter was left entirely to the very small body of Law Lords. The opinion of the minority of the judges was adopted, and Mr. O'Connell was released from prison.

Some ten years pass away, and the question of a Reform in Parliament is again mooted. Successive Governments, those headed respectively by Lord Aberdeen, Lord Derby, Lord Palmerston, all bring forward measures of their own. One of those bills, that of Earl Russell (as we must now call him), had a special provision intended to give some *protection and influence to minorities*. And at the moment when we are writing, a thoughtful supporter of the same principle, Mr. Hare, has been explaining to the Social Science Congress that his plan for giving weight to minorities has been received with favour

in many places; even, for instance, in Geneva—a city which, though once oligarchical, has been for the last eighteen years exceedingly democratic. However, all these Reform Bills failed. And why? From sheer alarm at the possibility of their throwing the main power of the State into the hands of a merely numerical majority.

Let us direct our gaze across the Atlantic. Ask the more refined and cultivated denizens of New York, how they reconciled it to their consciences to stand so completely aloof from all political struggles for so many years before the great disruption. They will answer, that they found the attempt to gain any weight in the management of affairs quite useless. Wealth, education, descent, all are swallowed up and overwhelmed by actual numbers; unless, indeed, the wealth be employed in the shape of wholesale bribery. There are those in New York, who go so far as to palliate this last-named way of proceeding as the least of two evils. That the rule of a mere majority might prove (despite many checks provided against it in the United States' Constitution) a very formidable evil, had been intimated by De Tocqueville, some thirty years since, in his celebrated work on America. The justice of his prediction is at least recognised thus far: that this evil is put forth by the South, as the one great cause of their secession. Such is the language of Mr. Jefferson Davis's inaugural address—'the tyranny of an unbridled majority, the most odious and least responsible form of despotism.'¹

It were passing strange, if that which American and European statesmen pronounce to be so intolerable in politics were found to be good in things sacred. One case, indeed, there is in which it may be right for a majority to use their utmost endeavours to crush the teaching of a minority, and that is the case of deadly heresy. But of this just now there is no question. The clergy in Scotland, who hold their incumbencies on the tenure of admitting the primary authority of the Scottish Liturgy, can hardly be supposed to have tolerated such a state of things as the supremacy of an Office supposed by them to be heretical.

It would far exceed our limits, were we to attempt an enumeration of the various methods by which the Church has endeavoured to check the sway of mere numbers. It may be sufficient to allude to that distinction between the *Ecclesia discens* and the *Ecclesia docens* which has led (as Sir F. Palgrave has observed) to the absence of lay names from all canons of Councils, which treat of doctrine as distinguished from discipline.

¹ Cited by Mr. Beresford Hope, in his 'Results of the American Disruption.'

But it is thoroughly germane to our present subject to observe, that if ever a religious community existed, which could ill afford to appeal to a purely numerical test, that community is the Episcopal Church in Scotland. In every other point of view she has strong, abundantly strong, ground. Even waiving for the moment those solemn questions of Apostolic government and succession, she can point to a variety of immense advantages. By her side, in rivalry, stand Presbyterian ministers who (however exemplary in practice) have signed documents so tremendous, that they all but universally shrink from ever setting forth in the pulpit that representation of the Almighty as a jealous tyrant, which is embodied in the Westminster Confession, and to which they have given their formal adhesion. And while the Kirk, with some honourable and distinguished exceptions, has for a long time frowned down literature and innocent amusements, Episcopacy has ever taken a gentler tone, and avoided the risk of driving men into the reckless use of ardent spirits as a compensation for the absence of less coarse forms of relaxation.¹ A mere handful of the population, Scotch Episcopalians have produced a list of distinguished men out of all proportion with their numbers. Their Episcopate has been in times past, and still is, composed of very remarkable men. We shall hardly be suspected, in this Review, of unduly praising a body, whose decisions we have had the misfortune to think ourselves compelled to criticise and oppose. The more safely, then, and fearlessly may we speak of the many virtues of that bench. Placed in a very trying position, without recognised rank, with miserably scanty incomes, they have been preserved from many dangers which beset the wearers of mitres better endowed with this world's goods and honours. No foundation of families on ecclesiastical revenues, no questionable votes in the House of Lords, can be thrown in the teeth of these prelates by their flocks. On the contrary, the great majority, more especially of those now living, have been serious losers by their munificence.

If there be any ground for this widely-spread distrust of the sway of mere numbers in affairs of state—if in questions of religion the importance and delicacy of the subject-matter render the danger unspeakably more imminent—then is it high time to ask those who would resign the Scottish Liturgy, whether they are not, so far as in them lies, tending to foster and encourage this perilous tendency.

¹ Much evidence on this head may be gleaned from the 3d volume of Chambers's 'Domestic Annals.' Confer also the striking article on Scotland in *Temple Bar*, No. III. We had marked this article for quotation, but the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* has anticipated us.

What is the announcement made in the very first page of the Dean of Edinburgh's pamphlet? On the subject of that canon (the 21st) of the present Scotch code, which assigns to this Liturgy its primary position, we are told that '*a very large majority of Scottish Episcopalians anxiously expect some adjustment of that canon in order to meet the requirements of public opinion.*'

'A very large majority!' 'The requirements of public opinion!' And is it really come to this? The test which would have condemned Elijah, condemned the seven thousand faithful ones, condemned the long roll of those under the elder covenant 'of whom the world was not worthy,' condemned the 'noble army of martyrs'—of its greatest crime we forbear to speak—has it suddenly become something so high and holy, that we are at once to bow to its verdict as authoritative and final? And in Scotland too; where 'public opinion' has long since pronounced—not against the Scottish Liturgy merely, but against Episcopacy itself, root and branch.

What if our fathers in the last century had listened to such appeals and acted on them? 'Public opinion' was then completely set against the use of the 'Athanasian Creed,' the Communion Service, and very much besides. The very apologists for Christianity did not wholly escape the lowering tone of their age. How should we have fared, if there had been handed down to us a prayer-book suited to the temper of the 'large majority' and 'the requirements of public opinion?'

One by one, of different tempers and in different ways, yet each doing their own appointed work, such persons as Bishop Butler, Robert Nelson, Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, Samuel Johnson, Bishop Gibson, the poet Cowper, Hannah More, William Wilberforce, contended for the value and importance of this or that objective truth, or internal sentiment, which their age was ready to throw away as obsolete and useless. And if such champions may have mourned at times over the little progress that half-forgotten truths appeared to make, they may have consoled themselves by such reflections as have since been embodied in those noble lines of the American poet, Bryant, wherein he compares the combatants for truth with those of the actual and material battle-field:—

'Soon rested those who fought; but thou
Who minglest in the harder strife
For truths which men receive not now,
Thy warfare only ends with life.
A friendless warfare! lingering long
Through weary day and weary year:
A wild and many-weaponed throng
Hang on thy front, and flank, and rear.

Yet nerve thy spirit to the proof,
And blench not at thy chosen lot.
*The timid good may stand aloof,
The sage may frown—yet faint thou not.*

* * * * *
Truth, crush'd to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshippers.

* * * * *
Another hand the sword shall wield,
Another hand the standard wave,
Till from the trumpet's mouth is peal'd
The blast of triumph o'er thy grave.'

In like manner do we thoroughly believe it possible that 'The Future of the Scottish Liturgy' is, that it should prove (in common with those of many other lands) 'an ensign to the nations' far and wide, a trumpet-voiced witness for the truth of the one great and infinite sacrifice, a weapon of priceless value against the assaults of Rationalism. But that 'Future' may perchance not be granted to our eyes to see; that change which the progress of Neology will operate in the minds of Christians may not be the work of a day, may not emerge until the present race of combatants has given way to a newer generation, and the hand that traces these lines be cold in dust.

Of what sort are the considerations that, in a religious controversy, lend weight to the judgment of the minority? Suppose that in reading a history of the Church in Africa, we found that, during the temporary triumph of the Donatists, one diocese had been conspicuous above the rest for its fidelity, and that this diocese employed, in more of its churches than did any other diocese, a particular liturgy. Surely this would be felt by impartial students to afford a strong claim for the retention of an office associated with such noble endurance in the evil day. Now, *mutato nomine*, this is actually the case. The diocese of Aberdeen is the diocese where (as even Lord Macaulay admits) Episcopacy was never really overthrown; and the diocese of Aberdeen is precisely that which employs, in much the largest proportion, the Scottish Liturgy.

Let us imagine that, in reading the account of a provincial Council, we found that the clergy of two dioceses were summoned, in an especially solemn and prayerful manner, to make choice of their representative among 'those of the second throne,' as Eusebius calls the presbyters; and that these two dioceses, though in a minority, agreed in supporting a certain cause. Would not such a fact deeply colour our estimate of the contest? Now, in the Synods lately held in Scotland, for the

choice of representatives, the dioceses of Moray and of Brechin have been summoned on this wise, and *both* (we believe) *send up defenders of the Scottish Liturgy.*

It is common to charge upon this often-calumniated Office the credit of everything that goes wrong in Scotland. So completely does this seem to be the case in the minds of certain of its opponents, that we have often doubted whether, even for their own sakes, it would not be a kindness to retain it. For if that liturgy were once abolished, they would lose the benefit of that consolation, which they now enjoy, of being able to account satisfactorily to their own minds for the origin of every conceivable failure and disappointment. So universal, with such persons, is the attribution of every possible lack of success to this one source, that at moments we have been irresistibly reminded of 'the great fire at Wolf's Crag,' which the ancient retainer, in the most pathetic of all Scott's tales, determined to assign as the cause of everything that was awanting to the House of Ravenswood.

Thus, for instance, the latest calamities of the Scottish Church, the trials of the Bishop of Brechin and of Mr. Cheyne, have been ascribed to the existence of this Office. The assertion is demonstrably false upon historical grounds. The Bishop of Brechin avowedly wrote and published his Charge in order to meet, by anticipation, any injury which might possibly accrue to the Church of which he was an overseer, from the dangers of the trial of Archdeacon Denison. The publication of Mr. Cheyne's sermons arose out of the first discussion of Bishop Forbes's Charge. In a word, that controversy *originated in England*, and then spread to Scotland. It had nothing whatever to do with the Scottish Office.

But says the Dean of Edinburgh, in his appeal to the defenders of this liturgy: 'You must have seen that no religious community in Scotland has so slight a hold upon the confidence and affections of the mass of her lay members as our own. No religious community contributes so little in comparison with the means at their disposal' (p. 24). We may grant the facts, while we utterly differ as to the cause. We may grant the facts, and at the same time gladly proclaim how much, how very much, in a contrary direction, has been effected by the influence of Dean Ramsay himself. We have heard, from those who were not of his school of theology, how admirably he has managed the members of his own congregation; how greatly the dangerous fashionableness of Episcopacy in Edinburgh has been saved from many perils attendant upon such a species of popularity by his plainness of speech, both within and without the walls of St. John's church. We know, too, of his ready and

unfailing hospitality extended, without the least regard of party, to all who have had the very slightest claim (or even no claim) upon his attention, of whom many would have looked for it vainly elsewhere. Few can hope to unite in their own persons so many gifts calculated to win the respect and attachment of their countrymen: nor would any consideration induce us thus to devote so many pages to an attack upon his arguments, were it not for the conviction that, in such a cause, it is most needful that this pamphlet should meet with a reply.

To return to the particular point at issue. Our case would be this: We believe that about one-tithe of the lack of zeal on the part of some of the laity may be attributable to the Scottish Office, and that this is amply compensated, not only by the value of that Office, as already set forth, but likewise by the increased zeal of other laymen who *are* attached to that Office. Who is the one layman of high political station who came down to speak courageous words for Scottish Episcopacy at Leith and Edinburgh last year? We need not name him; but it bears upon our present theme to observe, that he is a fervid admirer and supporter of the Scottish Liturgy.

But how, then, do we account for the remaining nine-tenths of that want of zeal which we lamentingly admit? We attribute it to the *very peculiar position of Scotch Episcopalians, living under a constitutional government, among countrymen of a different persuasion.* Let us try to explain this peculiarity.

Scotch Episcopalians are believed to possess above three-fifths of the land. They include in their ranks, with a very few exceptions, the nobles and the historic families.¹ But the relations between the many and the upper classes are very peculiar in Scotland: and while the masses entertain a deep respect for antiquity of race and local connexion, they combine with it a strong under-current of feeling against Episcopacy. There are few, if any, of the larger cities, in which an Episcopalian would have the slightest chance of being elected

¹ 'And what of the nobles and gentry? By the end of 1637, there were at least twenty of the Scottish nobles pledged, along with the leading clergy, and with the chief burghs, to the pending contest,—the Earls of Angus, Rothes, Sutherland, Dalhousie, Cassilis, Wemyss, and Lothian; and Lords Sinclair, Dalkeith, Lindsay, Balmerino, Burleigh, Hume, Boyde, Yesten, Cranstoun, Loudon, Montgomery, Dalzell, and Fleming. These names it is all the more necessary to enumerate, because most of them are still known in the highest ranks of our British peerage; although in course of time the Presbyterian associations, which were once their distinction, have ceased to encircle them; and their present wearers are almost to a man dutiful members of that Church into which their forefathers refused to be forced, but which has since, by a milder and more natural mode of suasion, attached to itself gradually the whole aristocracy of Scotland.'—*Professor Masson, in 'Macmillan's Magazine' for 1861 (Vol. iv. p. 373).*

as a member of parliament. In the counties, where broad acres and ancestral claims come into play, it is no doubt very different. Yet even there, *a zealous activity on behalf of their own communion is so much loss of political capital.*

We beg particular attention to this indisputable fact. Now it is a first axiom in moral theology, that we have no right to expect heroic virtue from the mass of ordinary Christians. But to be a zealous lay Churchman in Scotland does require some dash of the heroic. All honour to those who exhibit such conduct, and better things than any which they may lose here on earth! But, as human nature goes, we may often have felt regret, during a residence in North Britain, but seldom surprise, when we heard of such dialogues as these:— (1) ‘Well, Mr.—, has — been displaying any more of ‘his munificence in Church matters?’ ‘Why, since he was ‘returned for the county of —, he has become rather cooler; ‘at any rate, less demonstrative. His wife remains as staunch ‘as ever; but we must not look for so much from him.’ [N.B. The speaker was an Incumbent of by no means High-Church sentiments]. (2) ‘I suppose, Lady —, being a Church-woman, has contributed to the erection of the new church ‘at —?’ ‘No. She wrote to the Incumbent [himself, by ‘the way, a most liberal-handed donor], that she wished him all ‘success; but as her late husband had once occupied an official ‘position in connexion with the Scotch Establishment, it might ‘look disrespectful to his memory, if she were to aid in the ‘erection of an Episcopal Church.’ (3) ‘How very quietly ‘the opening of that new church at — was effected; I ‘know of many that would have gone up; but there was ‘no notice.’ ‘You see, the elections were just coming on; ‘and the brother of the lady who founded it did not wish ‘to remind people in an ostentatious manner of the family ‘creed.’ (4) ‘How is it, that I hear of Miss — going to ‘the Free Kirk on Sunday? I am sure she cannot like it.’ ‘The Free-Kirkers opposed her father at the last election, and ‘he wants to soften them.’

We might fill pages with revelations of this sort. We might tell of one county, where the Episcopalian lairds favoured their countrymen by contributing far more largely to the Presbyterian Establishment than to their own Church. We might name another, where the heir of one of the first families, whose father had for some years been the representative, ventured to attack the intense Sabbatarianism of his countrymen. Dr. Hessey said a good deal more than this gentleman in his ‘Bampton Lectures’ for 1860; and the *Edinburgh Review* declared, that the facts alleged by Dr. Hessey about Scotch

Sabbatarianism, could not be impeached by any who knew the country, though they might differ about the inferences deducible from them. This English divine, after the publication of these Lectures, received an honorary distinction from his bishop. Far different was the fate of the Scotch layman. Till then, he had enjoyed the fairest prospects of sitting for the county; but, from that day, his fate was sealed, and this much-prized honour fell from his grasp.

Will it be said that we are representing the Scottish laity as less courageous, less willing to make sacrifices for principle, further removed from the influence of the supernatural than the gentry of England? Not so: for it is well-nigh impossible to form a judgment, seeing that the English gentry have never yet been subjected to a similar trial. The relations between the two classes of the voters and their representatives are, we repeat, not only unknown in England, but they are barely conceivable. If a zealous Episcopalian is elected for a county or for any of the smaller Scotch burghs (and there are such among Scotch M.P.'s), it is despite his Churchmanship: just as some of Louis Philippe's supporters declared that they chose him for their king, *non parceque Bourbon, mais qu'ouique Bourbon*. His religious earnestness for his own communion is so much of dead weight against him. How astonished would English county members be to find this. When a few years since the late Mr. Sidney Herbert contested South Wilts with Lord Henry Thynne, who ever thought of alleging against the one candidate the magnificent church at Wilton, against the other, the munificent church restorations &c. effected by his mother, Lady Bath. In Scotland each candidate would have found this a serious drawback.

It is far otherwise across the Atlantic. There Presbyterianism is not established and endowed. There if the State shows any favour, it is rather for than against Episcopacy. There the army, as at West Point (and, perhaps, at other military colleges), hardly recognises any form of worship save the Episcopal. There no Lord Advocate ever finds his love for Apostolic order a difficulty to him as lawyer or member of congress. There whole flocks have come over to us, with their pastors, from Presbyterianism.

The presence of a Liturgy, very like the Scottish, has in no wise interfered with the progress of the Church in America. The withdrawal of the Scottish Liturgy immediately and *in toto* would, we firmly believe, scarcely make a particle of difference in the relations between the upper and lower classes in Scotland. As it is, in a very large portion of the country neither clergy nor laity need be troubled by its presence at all. 'To me,

writes Dean Ramsay, 'as an individual clergyman in English orders, the Scottish Office may be truly said to be a myth. 'After thirty-seven years' service in the Church, I have 'communicated but twice by the Scottish Office, and never 'officiated in the service at all.' After this, can we wonder that when it is sought to introduce a canon avowedly intended to abolish this Liturgy in a few years, Dr. Neale should say:— 'The contest is not ἐξ ἰσοῦ. We fight for a permissive use, 'our opponents contend for an absolute veto; we seek not 'to rob them of the Anglican Liturgy, they do seek to deprive 'us of our one little ewe lamb—the Scotch. Theirs is an 'aggression, ours a pure defence; theirs an innovation, ours 'the *status quo*: and therefore something more than a mere 'majority is, on every principle of moral justice, required, 'on the same principle that, when a committee that has no 'casting vote, or bench of judges, are equally divided, the 'motion falls to the ground.'

Another loss, if this Office is abolished, would be that of the practice of Reservation sanctioned by the Scottish use. On this point we hope to be able to add a word in an appendix.

Though we have not time to enter into details, we would beg the consideration of those most interested to a very important letter, headed *Votum pro Pace*, in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* for November 17, 1859. Even if they cannot assent to every position taken up by the writer, the Rev. G. H. Forbes, they will find it highly suggestive. Will not the abolition of the Scottish Office by majorities be a triumph of the less learned many over the more learned few?

We have not even touched upon the subject of the second pamphlet on our list. It may be that the mere thought of anything that even looked like a bargain, the desire to abstain from the very appearance of evil, and to provide things honest in the sight of all men, may have urged the writer of this very forcible brochure, in company with many more, into an overstrained view of the relations between the debate in Convocation and the meeting of the Scotch Bishops. But we must frankly own that the explanations, even of so eminently fair a person as the Bishop of Edinburgh, have not been wholly satisfactory to our minds; and knowing the *perferendum ingenium Scotorum*, we can hardly wonder if, after reading the debate in the English Convocation, there swept across the minds of many, for the moment, thoughts not wholly unlike those expressed in the fiery lines of Cowley:—

'. . . Come the eleventh plague rather than this should be;
Come, sink us rather in the sea.

Come rather, pestilence and reap us down;
Come God's sword rather than our own.

* * * * *

In all the bonds we ever bore;
We grieved, we sighed, we wept, *we never blushed before.*

Assuredly the mere fact of that debate is, to our minds, an argument against any serious alteration.

Three hundred years ago our English forefathers acted the part of Resigners. While avowing that the Office as it stood in the first book of King Edward was sound and scriptural, they yielded to the wishes of foreign Calvinists. Of such yieldings, whatever excuse be made for them, there can be but one result. *Those, to whom the concession is made, practically drag down the doctrine of a majority to their own level.*

III. A few words, and a few only, must be added with respect to the proposed alterations either in the actual language of the Office or in its position and authority in Scotland.

This is, in the main, the line which seems to have been taken by the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*. In advocating some such change, our contemporary has not, we are bound to say, been deficient either in fairness or in dignity. We may regret the loss of that thorough advocacy of the Office which used to distinguish the *Journal*, but its reasonings have been very temperate, and it has been open to the expression of opinions on both sides, so that forcible arguments, both *pro* and *contra*, may be read in the many able letters published in its columns.

Of course we must look facts in the face. If it be really found impossible to retain the Office precisely *in statu quo ante Synodum habitam*, it is for the defenders to make the best terms that they can. We will mention the various proposals.

(a.) We hear that an eminent English ritualist, who has lived in Scotland, suggests the adoption of the Laudian Office of 1637. That Office is, undoubtedly, one of great worth and beauty. But it must be remembered that it has never yet received any save royal authority: a circumstance likely to prejudice Scotchmen against it; for it is a prominent characteristic of Scottish religion (and surely a very noble one) to be very anti-Erastian. Moreover, this Office does not enjoy a good report of them that are without. It is the very service at which Janet Geddes threw her three-legged stool; and even cultivated Presbyterians, witness the Duke of Argyll, appear to have a kindly predilection for the memory of that particularly Christian and reverent action. Consequently, though we ourselves should have little or no objection to this change, it appears (not unnaturally) to lack support in Scotland.

(b.) A distinguished Scottish ritualist, Mr. G. H. Forbes, publishes an amended form of the Scottish Office. The changes which he proposes are in themselves an addition to the beauty and precision of the Office; but although most consonant (as we might expect) to ancient usages, they are so slight, that we feel almost convinced that they would fail to abate one iota of the prejudice, which ultra-Protestant associations, or want of intimate acquaintance with Holy Scripture and antiquity, have created in the minds of many Scottish lairds, and some persons who are not Scottish lairds.

(c.) The proposals of the Dean of Edinburgh (though supported by two eminent and excellent lay members of the committee) would leave the Office for the future in every congregation that uses it, *at the mercy of a mere majority of lay communicants*; without the faintest consideration for the zeal, learning, ability, or munificence which might distinguish the minority, without the slightest regard for the feelings or wishes of the new incumbent. *We earnestly trust and pray that this proposed form of Canon XXXII. of the New Code may be utterly and summarily rejected.*

(d.) With sincere diffidence we should venture to think that the best course for those who love and cherish 'this most beautiful and affecting service'¹ would be (if they find it hopeless to preserve it) an adoption of the proposals of Mr. Forbes Irvine, of Drum. If that modification be untenable, they might fall back upon the changes suggested by Mr. Walker of Bowland. [We hope to print these proposals in an Appendix.]

And now it remains alone that we pray, and entreat others to pray, that the Divine blessing may rest upon the acts of this forthcoming Synod. Most completely do we agree with Dr. Neale that these weapons may avail more than all other arguments and influences put together. The proposed Code of New Canons, though presenting many points which require delicate handling, and thoughtful, prayerful consideration, reflects the very highest credit on the tact, judgment, and good feeling of the committee. The possession of laymen so able and devoted is a great fact in itself. May their labours avail to the furtherance of all that is good in their Church, and therefore (it is a necessary consequence) prove a blessing to the realm of Scotland.

¹ *Quarterly Review*, No. CLVIII.

APPENDIX.

1. ON RESERVATION FOR THE SICK.

It was once the writer's privilege to assist in ministering to the needs of the sick and dying in the houses and hospitals of a manufacturing town at a time when it was visited by a virulent typhoid fever. One of the curates fell a victim to his zeal; and the Roman Catholic priests in the place were excused by their superiors from hearing confessions, though not before two or three of their number had died in consequence. As we quitted the room of the hospital with a priest who had been administering to some of the sick, what may have proved their last reception, he said to us, 'I do regret that we have not retained the use of reservation: to have to consecrate, under such circumstances, amidst such sights and sounds, was painful; and it must, I fear, have seemed irreverent to those Irish who were lying near us.' It might have been added, that reservation would have shortened the service for the recipient, and saved what was then very valuable time for the clergy. A few years later, the same town, in common with very many more, suffered severely from cholera. Reports reached the writer (no longer a resident there) of the same want being keenly and urgently felt. Time was, humanly speaking, everything; and the power of reservation would have (practically) much extended the time at disposal. It may be observed that the Articles do not represent the practice to be unprimitive, or even unapostolic, but simply deny that it is 'by Christ's ordinance.' Almost as much might, perhaps, be said about Confirmation.

Little did we think that there was any part of Britain wherein this ancient custom still obtained. Whatever defence may be made for its rejection at the Reformation, few, we believe, who have ever seen it in use, will maintain that it is now liable to abuse, or that it is not a practice as eminently convenient and reverential as it is primitive. But if the Scottish Churchmen give up their Liturgy, they will lose all the benefit of reservation. Some years afterwards, it will hardly be believed that a Christian community possessed this treasure and ruthlessly flung it away! But we, as we have said, hope better things. We look for a brighter *Future of the Scottish Liturgy*. With an ancient poet, heathen though he was, we feel—

"Ελπεσθαι χρὴ πάντ', ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲν ἀελπτον.
ῥάδια πάντα Θεῷ τέλεσαι, καὶ ἀνήνυτον οὐδέν.¹

APPENDIX II.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED FOR REVISION OF THE CODE OF CANONS.

BISHOP of EDINBURGH.	WILLIAM STUART WALKER, Esq. of Bowland.
BISHOP of GLASGOW.	WILLIAM LESLIE, Esq. of Warthill.
DEAN of EDINBURGH, <i>Convener</i> .	ALEXANDER FORBES IRVINE, Esq. of Drum.
REV. CHARLES PRESSLEY, Fraserburgh.	JAMES STEUART, Esq. W.S.
REV. GEO. HAY FORBES, Burntisland.	
WILLIAM SMYTHE, Esq. of Methven.	
HUGH JAMES ROLLO, Esq., W.S., <i>Clerk</i> .	

¹ Fragment of Lines given in the *Poetæ Gnomici* (Ed. Tauch.).

APPENDIX III.

PROPOSALS BY DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.

The DEAN OF EDINBURGH, Mr. SMYTHE of Methven, and Mr. LESLIE of Warhill, propose that the remainder of this Canon shall be as follows:—

6. The Services and Ritual of this Church shall be, so far as circumstances admit, identical with the Services and Ritual of the Book of Common Prayer. The Communion Service of the Episcopal Church in Scotland is hereby declared to be that of the Communion Service of the Church of England, and the same shall be used at the consecration of Bishops, the ordinations of Priests and Deacons, and at the opening of all General Synods and all Diocesan Synods.

7. This enactment shall not affect the present practice of the congregations of this Church who now use the Office for the administration of the Holy Communion, generally known as the Scottish Communion Office. In such congregations the use of the said Scottish Communion Office shall be continued during the lifetime of the present Incumbents, except in cases where the Incumbent and a majority of the congregation shall petition the Bishop of the Diocese to have the exclusive use of the Office contained in the Book of Common Prayer.

8. On the death or resignation of any Incumbent of a church where the Scottish Office is now used, the Office of the Book of Common Prayer shall be at once adopted, except a petition shall be offered by a majority of the male communicants in favour of the continuance of the Scottish Office; and this rule shall apply to the case of every death or resignation of an Incumbent in all time coming where the Scottish Office is used.

Mr. WALKER of Bowland proposes, that, in addition to the five Sections agreed to by the Committee, the following Sections should be adopted:—

6. The Scotch Communion Office hereby authorized shall be held to be that form of the said Office, which is signed by the Bishops of this Church as relative hereto. The same shall be deposited for preservation among the records of the Episcopal Synod; and it is hereby declared that the Scotch Communion Office, as hereby authorized, and the English Office, are held by this Church to be identical in doctrine and of equal authority.

7. In all congregations formed after the date of these Canons, the persons forming the congregation, or a majority of them, shall determine, subject to the approval of the Bishop of the Diocese, which of the two offices shall be used therein.

8. No substitution of the one Office for the other shall be lawful in any congregation, unless three-fourths at the least of the Male Communicants shall have expressed in writing their desire for the change, and the Bishop of the Diocese shall have signified in writing his approval thereof.

9. An appeal to the Episcopal Synod against the Bishop's decision shall be competent under Sections 6 and 7 of this Canon, and the decision of the Episcopal Synod shall be final.

10. In all consecrations of Bishops, and at the opening of all General Synods, the two Offices shall be used alternately on each successive occasion.

Mr. JAMES STEUART, W.S., adopts Mr. WALKER's leading Clauses, subject to the following alteration:—

That the English Office shall in future be used in all new congregations, and at all Consecrations, Ordinations, and Synods.

Mr. FORBES IRVINE of Drum proposes, that in addition to the five Sections agreed to by the Committee, the following Sections should be adopted :—

6. As in order to promote a union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, permission was formerly granted by the Bishops to retain the use of the English Communion Office in all congregations where the said Office had been previously in use, the same permission is now ratified and confirmed.

7. The Scottish Communion Office shall continue to be held of primary authority in this Church, and shall be used not only in all Consecrations of Bishops, but also at the opening of all General Synods.

8. If the Incumbent of any congregation, and one-half of the male communicants, qualified in terms of Canon XXIV., request the Bishop of the Diocese to sanction the alternative use of the English and Scottish Offices in such congregation, such sanction shall be given by the Bishop; and if the Incumbent of any congregation, and three-fourths of the male communicants, qualified as above, request the Bishop to sanction the substitution of either Office for the other in such congregation, such sanction shall be given by the Bishop.

Rev. G. H. FORBES proposes, that, in addition to the five Sections agreed to by the Committee, the following Sections should be adopted, if they should be agreed to by both those who use the Scotch Communion Office and those who use the English Office; the subject-matter of the present Canon partaking (as has been twice decided by the Episcopal Synod) of the nature of a compact between these two parties, and consequently, as Mr. G. H. FORBES maintains, not being within the competency of a mere majority in the General Synod; it being, in fact, the 'acknowledged practice,' which Canon XXXIII. of the present Code declares a General Synod has not the power to alter :—

6. As, in order to promote a union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, permission was formerly granted by the Bishops to retain the use of the English Communion Office in all congregations where the said Office had been previously in use, the same permission is now ratified and confirmed.

7. In all other congregations formed prior to the enactment of the present code of Canons, the arrangements now in force with regard to the use of the Scotch Communion Office, or of that contained in the Book of Common Prayer presently used in the United Church of England and Ireland, or of their alternate use, are hereby confirmed and sanctioned.

8. In any congregation formed after the enactment of these Canons, the Bishop shall ascertain which Office the majority of the communicants composing it desire to be used, and shall make order accordingly.

9. If at any time a petition, signed by a majority of the regular communicants of two years' standing of any congregation, be presented to the Bishop of the Diocese, praying that the Communion Office used in the said congregation may be altered, he shall direct such change to be made.

10. If a minority of the regular communicants in any congregation in which the Scotch Communion Office is used, shall express to the Bishop, in writing, their desire to have opportunities of communicating according to the Communion Office of the Church of England, or *vice versa*, the Bishop shall permit the use of the said other Office at such times as shall not interfere with the existing services of said congregation. Provided that if the Pastor of that congregation be unwilling to celebrate, or to provide for the celebration of such additional services, the petitioners shall present to the Bishop some other Presbyter, to be by him licensed to perform the same.

11. The edition of the Scotch Communion Office to be used on all public occasions, and to be referred to in the Church Courts on questions of doctrine, is hereby declared to be the copy annexed to this Code of Canons: Provided that any congregation presently using the Scotch Communion Office may continue to use the edition in common circulation at present.

(N.B.—*The suggested edition has been printed, and will be furnished on application to Rev. G. H. Forbes.*

12. The Scotch Office shall be used at all Consecrations and Ordinations, and at Synods, whenever the Holy Eucharist is celebrated at them; but no ecclesiastical censure shall be incurred by any person attending a Synod for declining to communicate thereat.

13. By the term 'regular communicant,' shall be understood a person who in the course of the year has communicated at least three times, of which the festival of Easter, or of Whitsunday or of Christmas, has been one.

APPENDIX IV.

The alterations in the new edition of the Scottish Liturgy proposed by the Rev. G. H. Forbes are not numerous. They appear to be based upon the Liturgy of S. James; and are, as has been intimated, of much beauty. The most important is the addition to the Invocation. Immediately after the words 'that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son,' it is added, 'for the forgiveness of our sins, for our growth in grace, for the bringing forth of good works, and for obtaining life everlasting.' No liturgical scholar can object to this, but it will not satisfy the objectors.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE ARTICLE ON 'ESSAYS AND
REVIEWS' (page 102).

London, June 26, 1862.

SINCE the above was in type the judgment of the Court of Arches has been given in the cases of the Bishop of Salisbury *v.* Williams, and Findall *v.* Wilson. The delay in pronouncing judgment was notoriously caused by the appeal in the case of the Bishop of Winchester *v.* Heath. Our readers are aware that the highest court has rejected the appeal of Mr. Heath, and affirmed the judgment of the lower court. They are also aware that the Judge in the Court of Arches intentionally delayed his judgment till he should hear whether his previous judgment would be negatived or not. The evident reluctance with which Dr. Lushington pronounced judgment against Mr. Heath, would have led many to suppose that he waited for the express purpose of seeing whether the higher court would reverse any such condemnation as he might consequently be led to express.

There can be no doubt that had the judgment of the Privy Council acquitted Mr. Heath, it would have carried with it the acquittal of Mr. Wilson and of Dr. Williams. It would have been plain that no opinion of any kind on the side of leaving all doctrines open questions, possibly with the exception of certain doctrines of the Church of Rome, could be judged at variance with the letter of the formularies of the Church of England. It is conceivable that the direct and formal contradiction in terms of a statement in the Prayer Book or Articles might still be thought to afford matter for prosecution, but practically the effect would have been that a Clergyman might hold, unrebuked, any opinion that he pleased on theological matters. We suppose, that had the judgment in the case of Burder *v.* Heath been different from what it was, Dr. Lushington would have conceived himself bound to pronounce sentence at once in favour of the defendants in the two famous cases upon which judgment *was to be pronounced* yesterday. We advisedly use the words *was to be pronounced*, for we cannot see that any judgment has actually been pronounced. We venture to think that there was no person interested in this trial who anticipated any such evasion of a difficulty as that to which Dr. Lushington has resorted. We had our own opinion as to which way the sentence of the court would go. Others may have entertained a different opinion, but probably all concurred in the expectation that Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson would either be declared to have contravened the formularies of the Church of England, and so rendered them-

selves liable to deprivation, subject, of course, to their right of appeal to the higher court, or that a declaration would have been enunciated to the effect that such statements as they had made were within the limit of that liberty of interpretation granted to clergymen of the Church of England.

Instead of this we have the following so called 'Judgment' pronounced. It occurs at the end of an elaborate summary, both of the attack and defence of Dr. Rowland Williams. That we may not misrepresent the learned judge, we give his own words:—

'The result of the observation I have made in this case is, that these articles must be reformed by striking out all those I have rejected, and by partial alterations in others. I think my Judgment will clearly point out what I deem requisite, and that I need not expend further time in recapitulation. Looking at the great importance of this case, and that in fact, though not in form, I have pronounced a decision upon the merits, I will, if it be desired, give to either or both parties leave to appeal to her Majesty in Council.'

The only mode in which we can interpret the above is as follows:—The judge expresses his opinion that certain of the articles charged against the defendant must be rejected, certain others ought to be reformed, and that the remainder must be admitted, and that before judgment is pronounced, he allows of an appeal to the Privy Council, for either party. How an appeal can be where there is nothing to appeal from, entirely transcends our limited powers of understanding. It looks very much like the case of a judge not liking to give judgment in a case, in a direction contrary to his wishes, and getting out of the difficulty by suggesting that another court should take upon itself the decision of the case.

In proceeding to criticize, not the judgment of the Court of Arches, but the private opinion of the presiding judge, we must take it for granted that our readers are aware of the form of the indictment, and the general line of defence taken by the counsel for the defendants. Those who have not followed the proceedings, nor had the opportunity of reading the speech for the defence of Dr. Williams, made by Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, which has since been published entire, will be able to follow what we have to say, if they will take the trouble to refer to the learned judge's summing up of the case, which appeared in the *Times* of this morning.

Of the seventeen articles of the indictment, Dr. Lushington rejects all from the eighth to the seventeenth inclusive, with the exception of the twelfth, the fifteenth, and the sixteenth, the first of which he thinks must be reformed, and the other two must be admitted. With much of what the learned judge has alleged on this subject we entirely concur. There can be no doubt to our mind that, shocking as Dr. Williams's opinions on the subject of prophecy are, and entirely differing as they do from any views that have hitherto been entertained by any Churchmen, the expression of them given us in his eulogy of Baron Bunsen does not, in express terms, contravene any formulary or article of the Church of England. The same may be said of Dr. Williams's opinion as regards the authorship and contents of the books of Daniel and Jonah. Dr. Lushington truly observes that this does not amount to a denial of the canonicity of these two books, a denial which, as he remarks, would be a con-

travention of the Sixth Article of the Church of England. It is only when we come to the tenth article of the indictment that we find ourselves seriously at variance with Dr. Lushington. One part of this count charges Dr. Williams with the denial of the canonical authority of the Second Epistle of S. Peter. The passage from the Essay was quoted by the judge, and runs as follows:—

‘The second of the Petrine Epistles having alike external and internal evidence against its genuineness is necessarily surrendered as a whole; and our critic’s good faith in this respect is more certain than the ingenuity with which he reconstructs a part of it.’ ‘The second chapter may not improbably be a quotation, but its quoter and the author of the rest of the epistle need not, therefore, have been S. Peter.’ Dr. Lushington concludes from this sentence that Dr. Williams denies the *genuineness* of the second Epistle of S. Peter—*i. e.* that he denies that the writer of that epistle was the Apostle to whom it is generally ascribed; and he refuses to condemn him on this account, because the idea of genuineness is distinct from that of canonical authority. ‘If,’ says he, ‘I was to condemn on this statement, I must hold that the denying a book to be genuine necessarily implies a denial of its canonicity, and does not mean exclusively a denial of the particular authorship. Considering the word *genuine* is susceptible of these two meanings, I think there is a doubt as to the sense in which Dr. Williams has expressed himself, and if there be a doubt, as this is a criminal case, he is entitled to the benefit of it.’ Now, we have explained in the earlier part of this article that genuineness has nothing whatever to do in ordinary cases with authenticity or authority. The distinction is one which is recognised in all elementary works on theology, and every student is familiar with it. In the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is also alluded to in the judgment, Dr. Williams is certainly entitled, not to the benefit of a doubt, as the learned judge absurdly enough expresses it. If he doubts whether S. Paul wrote that epistle he is entitled to acquittal from any charge which is fastened on him as contravening anything that he is bound to believe. No one is bound to believe in the authorship; but the clergy are certainly bound to believe that it is authoritative, whoever its author might have been. But now let us see how the case stands with regard to the Second Epistle of S. Peter. It is admitted on all hands, by Dr. Williams himself, by the counsel for the defence, and by the learned judge, that its genuineness is denied. That is to say, Dr. Williams asserts that S. Peter was not the author. Now, if we turn to the epistle itself we shall see that it asserts its own authorship in the most unequivocal terms. It begins with the words, ‘Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Christ,’ &c. It proceeds further on to allude to the transfiguration, so that the writer again here pretends to be S. Peter, when he says, ‘And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with Him in the holy mount.’ Again, towards the end of the epistle we have an allusion to a previous letter in the words, ‘This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you, in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance’—and again the writer speaks of himself as being one of ‘the apostles of the Lord and Saviour.’ Nothing can be clearer, then, than that the writer, whoever he was,

pretended to be S. Peter. Well, then, it follows from this that he who denies that this epistle was written by the apostle must consider it a mere forgery. There is no intermediate position which can be maintained, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which contains no internal evidence to decide the matter. Either S. Peter wrote this epistle, or it is a simple forgery from beginning to end, and as such entitled to no authority whatever. And we submit that it is impossible to conceive a more distinct contradiction of the Sixth Article of the Church of England, than this amounts to. The Article asserts that 'All the Books of the New Testament as they are commonly received' (and no one will attempt to question that S. Peter's Second Epistle was, at the time of drawing up of the Thirty-nine Articles, and has ever since been, recognised as one of the Books so received), 'we do receive and account them canonical.' And here we are tempted to say a few words on a distinction which is so frequently insisted on in the judgments in the Court of Arches. We have been told over and over again, that it is a court for a decision of law and not of theology. This is quite true, and we have no objection to allege against the statement in the general. And we entirely acquiesce in the maxim laid down by Dr. Lushington, in his preliminary remarks, that following the opinion of the Judicial Committee in the case of *Burder v. Heath*, he was bound to look solely to the Formularies and Articles of the Church—that it would be a departure from his duty if he were to admit any discussion as to the conformity or non-conformity of the Articles of Religion, or any of them with the Holy Scriptures. We quite agree that an appeal to Scripture, in any such case, is beside the point. When the doctrine of the Church of England has fixed the sense of Scripture, the clergy are bound by that sense; where it has not done so, such points must be considered open questions. We, therefore, give our cordial assent to the judgment pronounced, that 'The articles' in which Dr. Williams is accused of contravening passages of Scripture, such as those selected for the epistles and gospels in the Communion Service, 'must be reformed by striking out all reference to extracts from the Bible found in the Prayer Book. Pressed by these reasons,' says Dr. Lushington, 'and urged by every motive to preserve peace in the Church, I will not be tempted, in the trial of any accusation against a clergyman, to resort to Scripture as the standard by which the doctrine shall be measured; and I may with perfect truth add that were such a task imposed upon me, the want of theological knowledge would incapacitate me from adequately discharging it.' It is not, perhaps, to be expected that a lawyer should be a profound theologian; and perhaps in many, or even most cases that come before the Court of Arches for decision, little theological knowledge is requisite to determine what is the meaning of the propositions in the formularies by which the judge has to test any given doctrine which a clergyman is accused of publishing. Yet the province of law and the province of theology are not so distinct but what here and there they run into each other. The instance of the genuineness of S. Peter's Second Epistle is in point, and we cannot but think either that the possession of some of that theological knowledge which the learned judge candidly admits he does not possess, would be desirable, or else that the judge in the Court of Arches should have a theologian for his assessor.

With regard to the other articles of the indictment which are rejected, we have not much to say. The last article imputes a tendency in the Essay to inculcate a disbelief of the Divine inspiration and orthodoxy of the Holy Scriptures, to deny the truth of part thereof, and to deny the doctrines of original sin, justification by faith, atonement, propitiation, and the incarnation. We should be unwilling to rest any case on so indefinite a charge as this; and we are content to acquiesce with Dr. Lushington in the principles laid down by the Judicial Committee in the case of *Burder v. Heath*, viz. 'that the words or writings of the person accused must be pleaded; that the meaning which they are alleged by the prosecution to convey must be pleaded, and the particular Articles of Religion or parts of them asserted to be contravened must be pleaded also.' The most important article that Dr. Lushington has admitted is the fifteenth, and his admission of it is to the effect that the following passage from Dr. Williams's Essay is inconsistent with the eleventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.

'Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind or sense of Divine approval which comes of trust in a righteous God rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? S. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility as opposed to sacerdotalism.'

Lastly, to say one word about the seventh and twelfth articles of the indictment which are directed to be reformed. In giving judgment on the seventh, the learned judge affords another illustration of the necessity for theological knowledge in one who has to express a legal opinion upon a theological subject. Dr. Lushington professes to be altogether unable to understand the meaning of the words 'a despairing school, which forbids us to trust in God or in conscience unless we kill our souls with literalism;' he therefore passes them by without further notice. Of another passage in the same count he attempts some explanation, and gives his opinion that it does not go the length of impugning the Articles or formularies. The passage is as follows:—

'Again, on the side of external criticism, we find the evidences of our canonical books, and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustrative in outward act of principles perpetually true, but not adequate to guarantee narration inherently incredible or precepts evidently wrong.'

We have no doubt that the explanation given by the judge of this passage, which is the more difficult of the two, is substantially correct; viz. 'that the clergy are at liberty to reject parts of Scripture upon their own opinion that the narrative is inherently incredible, to disregard precepts in Holy Writ because they think them evidently wrong.' But we really are at a loss to conceive what difficulty there is in interpreting the other passage, which has precisely the same drift. It is not otherwise of importance than as illustrating the position we have laid down, that legal knowledge is not sufficient in itself to pronounce upon theological formularies. However, upon the obscurity of these two passages in the count of the indictment, the count itself is directed to be reformed. To us it appears that the foolish and confused statements of these passages might well have been passed by altogether; and on the judge's own showing the count ought to have been admitted on the score of the two other passages quoted. Dr. Lushington is as explicit as we could have desired in

stating his opinion as to the monstrous proposition that the Bible is 'an expression of devout reason,' and is 'the written word of the congregation. We have seldom read anything more lucidly expressed than the judgment upon these two passages and the principle upon which it is pronounced.

Rightly, as it appears to us, declining to enter upon any discussion as to what was 'the earliest creed of the Church,' Dr. Lushington confines his attention to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, and he decides that if the Bible be 'God's Word written,' it is not 'the expression of devout reason,' and adds that there is not to be found in the Articles or in the Formularies a single syllable consistent with the assertion that the Bible is the voice of the congregation. We repeat, however, that we can see no reason why the obscurity of one part of the expressions charged against an author should form a safeguard to him, to shield him from the legal penalty he may have incurred by other and more definite statements. We cannot understand why this article should not have been admitted, without regard had to either of the passages which have induced the learned judge to direct that it shall be reformed.

With regard to the twelfth count, Dr. Williams has again the benefit of a doubt given him, to the extent that this article is directed to be reformed because the judge is not satisfied of the meaning to be attached to the following sentence:—

'Salvation from evil, through sharing the Saviour's spirit, was shifted into a notion of purchase from God through the price of His bodily pangs. The deep drama of heart and mind become externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual!'

'I am not satisfied,' says Dr. Lushington, 'that Dr. Williams intended thereby to maintain that Christ did not suffer, nor was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, nor to be a sacrifice for the original guilt as well as for the actual sins of men.'

Upon the whole we are of opinion that, with the exception of the remarks we have felt it our duty to make upon this judgment, it is scarcely possible for any one understanding the merits of the case to make any objection to the opinion delivered by Dr. Lushington. We must be allowed again to express our regret that the judgment was not formally delivered. We regret that the presiding judge in any court should have so expressed himself, as to leave ground for thinking that he was unwilling to pronounce judgment, or that he had misgivings as to a case which, it appears to us, could not in the judgment of common sense and common equity, have been other than the conclusion which has been arrived at. In the concluding remarks of the judgment in the case of *Fendall v. Wilson*, the same mistrusting of his own judgment and timidity as regards the strictures of the clergy, is even more apparent. He concludes:—

'I cannot leave these two cases without adding a few words in conclusion. I have discharged my duty to the best of my ability. I am aware that these judgments will be severely canvassed by the clergy and by others. Be it so; thereby it may be ascertained whether they are in accordance with law; and accordance with law ought to be the sole object of a court of justice. It may

'be that on the present occasion some may think that so far from having gone too far, I have taken too limited a view of power entrusted to me, and, consequently, have failed to apply a remedy where a remedy might seem to be wanted. I can only say I have shaped my course according to the authority I am bound to follow—the authority of the Privy Council.'

Besides the judgment on the particular counts of the indictment, there is much that is interesting in the introductory matter of Dr. Lushington's speech. In giving his opinion as to the first class of objections taken by the counsel for the defence, viz. that divers opinions are imputed to Dr. Williams which he has not maintained, he takes occasion to lay down the law as regards a review of an infidel book by a clergyman, and decides that it is not competent to the reviewer, when he either states or professes to give the substance of unsound doctrine from the work reviewed, to leave his own opinion in the dark. In the present instance, he thinks that Dr. Williams shows a general but not indiscriminate approval of the opinions quoted from the works of Baron Bunsen. To all this we think it almost impossible for any reasonable person to object. The next class of exceptions taken to the indictment was of this form:—that the opinions imputed to him have been submitted to a test not warranted by ecclesiastical law, viz. extracts from the Bible. Here again, we think it impossible for any thoughtful person to maintain an objection to the principles laid down that the Prayer-book, the Articles, the Canon, and the Homilies, are the only standards of doctrine. There was no necessity to distinguish between the Homilies and the other formularies, because, in the present case, no offence was alleged against the Homilies; but we have always thought it of the last importance that no pleadings from Scripture should be allowed in a law court. The matter really requires no argument. Nothing can be plainer than that if they were, the whole controversy with Rome, as well as the differences between the Church of England and Protestant bodies, would have perpetually to be argued again, and there would be practically no advantage in the Church possessing any standard of doctrine—so far, that is, as the prevention of the clergy impugning that doctrine was concerned. Again, the unanimous opinion of the bench of bishops was not entitled to any weight in influencing the opinion of the judge, excepting so far forth as any of them may have been learned theologians, and have assisted him in coming to a right understanding either of what the author had said, or of the true meaning of the formularies, by which what he had said would have to be tested. It would seem to be included in this, that the judge was bound, as he professes himself bound, to disregard the opinions of any amount of theologians of the Church of England brought to bear upon the subject. We can only wish that he had here been consistent, and, instead of adhering to the unhappy precedent of the Gorham case, had absolutely rejected all quotations of such authorities, whether alleged by the prosecution or for the defence. In the present instance, the admitting any such opinions makes no difference in the case; for Dr. Williams, for the most part, and as regards the most obnoxious of the statements he has made, stands absolutely alone. In the Gorham case, we cannot but think that they were admitted for the express purpose of reviewing the judgment in the Court of Arches, in order to save Mr. Gorham and the rest of the Evangelical

clergy who disbelieve the plain statement of the Prayer-book on the subject of baptismal regeneration. We think the precedent is most unfortunate, and that especially because the judgment was given in direct contradiction to the opinion of the late Bishop of London, the only theological assessor who was at all competent to give an opinion on the subject.

We have one more grave objection to allege to Dr. Lushington's judgment, and with it we must conclude this already too long postscript. We entirely concur in the opinion laid down that the Articles and the Formularies are the legal tests of doctrine to be applied in the present case. We regret that we must entirely dissent from, and earnestly protest against, the principle laid down that the Court should look first to the Articles, then to the Book of Common Prayer. On the contrary, we think it cannot be too earnestly contended that the Prayer-book contains the doctrines of the Church of England, and that the Articles are, of their very nature, and upon their own showing, a temporary protest, which it may or may not be expedient to continue, against certain false doctrines and practices whether on the Protestant or the Roman side. We say this is palpable on the very surface of the Articles—as, for instance, when it is said that a certain code of doctrine is necessary for these times—the Church of England claims to be the same Church as was established in this country before the time of the Restoration, when the last great changes took place, as well as before the time of the Reformation, by virtue of her inheritance of the apostolic descent through her bishops, and her inheritance of doctrine through her Prayer-book—that continuity would be equally preserved even if in the present or some subsequent generation it should be deemed fit to abolish the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and even if the Church should declare its opinion that they should be abolished altogether. It may be thought an important point whether the preference should be given to the Articles or to the Formularies; but it is not so. The ill effect of any such preference could easily be argued from the fact that the Articles are notoriously ambiguous, and the Prayer-book in its dogmatic statements extremely definite. Moreover, there is a *prima facie* difference between the two which greatly increases the weight of this argument. The subject is, however, too large for a postscript, and our space warns us that we must conclude.

NOTICES.

WE have received two works from M. F. Huet, of Paris—a life of his ‘guide, philosopher, and friend,’ M. Bordas-Demoulin, and a pamphlet on the solution of the Roman question. The ‘Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages’ of the somewhat eccentric, but able and high-principled philosopher and theologian, is very interesting, and will well repay perusal. M. Bordas-Demoulin is not, we believe, much known in England; and we may possibly, in one of our next numbers, revert to him at greater length, and give an account of his very curious life and of his principal works. The present biography is to be had at Michel Levy’s. M. Huet’s other work is entitled, ‘La Sujétion temporelle des Papes; solution politique et catholique de la Question Romaine,’ and is, of course, published by our old friend, M. Dentu, of the Palais-Royal. We shall give, in the author’s own words, the scope and object of his *brochure*:—‘Une admirable et ‘profonde harmonie régnant entre toutes les vérités, il se trouve que la ‘vraie solution politique est en même temps la vraie solution religieuse. ‘C’est la partie du débat sur laquelle on a porté le moins la lumière. En ‘général, le libéralisme s’est tu; le fanatisme seul a parlé. Il sème dans ‘l’univers catholique le trouble et les alarmes. On dépeint l’humiliation ‘du pape, et l’humiliation de l’Eglise dans sa personne; on le représente ‘dépendant du roi d’Italie ou des autres princes, et toute l’Eglise, toutes ‘les consciences asservies avec lui. La foi rougit de ces indignes alarmes. ‘J’établirai que le papauté temporelle, loin d’être nécessaire ou utile à ‘l’Eglise, fut dès son origine et ne cessa jamais d’être la grande plaie du ‘catholicisme; qu’elle a tout matérialisé, par conséquent tout faussé dans ‘une religion essentiellement spirituelle; qu’elle ne fut pour les papes ‘mêmes que la dégradation et l’asservissement de leur autorité spirituelle. ‘J’établirai que l’indépendance du saint-siège, pour laquelle on réclame de ‘l’or, des biens-fonds, la sanction des traités, repousse comme une contradiction et un outrage ces profanes appuis, et qu’au lieu de tomber sous la ‘domination d’aucun prince, le pape-sujet, nul dans l’Etat, échappe pour ‘jamais aux exigences comme aux faveurs des rois de la terre. Enfin, ‘j’établirai que le retour de la papauté à sa primitive et normale condition, ‘suscitera la réforme et le rajeunissement du catholicisme. Cette réforme ‘sera l’avènement décisif de l’âge moderne, car il mettra fin à la crise ‘religieuse qui dure depuis la Renaissance’ (p. 3). We will not venture to assert that M. Huet *has* proved, to the satisfaction of everybody, all the points he undertakes to establish; much less shall we declare that we agree in all the principles and opinions, political, social, and religious, put forth by the respected author—just the reverse (M. Huet, like his master M. Bordas-Demoulin, entertains somewhat exceptional views on one or two matters); but we must, at any rate, acknowledge that his pamphlet is

written throughout in a very earnest tone and with great ability, and that it contains more than one striking remark expressed in very vigorous language. M. Huet accepts in full the doctrine of the Pope's primacy by Divine right, which is more than the Abbé Guettée and other French ecclesiastics do, but rejects all notions of a 'theoretic sovereignty' as most injurious to the Church. He, however, most enthusiastically predicts the speedy downfall of the Pope's temporal power:—'Oui, le pape va cesser d'être roi, et jamais plus heureuse nouvelle ne fut annoncée à l'Eglise. C'est l'œuvre de la délivrance qui s'accomplit.' Our author looks with anything but disfavour on the 'great principle of '89,' but has a special horror of the Middle Ages. Like the Abbé Guettée, M. Huet greatly deplores the ignorance prevalent on the subject of 'Catholicism' and religion generally among his co-religionists.

We are glad to see a new edition of M. Droz's original and sterling '*Histoire du Règne de Louis XVI. pendant les années où l'on pouvait prévenir ou diriger la Révolution française*' (Paris: Renouard). It is one of the best and most impartial of the many French accounts of the Revolution of 1789; and to those wishing to study the causes which led to that great event, fraught, as it has been, with the most momentous and permanent results, we cordially recommend the book. The introduction, in particular, strikes us as very valuable; it is quite a model of historic research and philosophical investigation, and strongly reminds us of Guizot. We regret, however, the work should terminate with the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly. It should at least have been carried down to the death of Louis XVI. Let us add, that the present edition of the deceased Academician's work is enriched with a notice of his life and works from the pen of a distinguished friend of his—himself one of the most eminent of living historians—M. de Bonnechose. The *Notice sur l'auteur et ses ouvrages* is one of the most finished and appropriate compositions of that nature we have ever read.

The Bishop of Brechin has published a very striking and beautiful sermon, entitled, 'The Sanctity of Christian Art' (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas). It was preached at the reopening of Rosslyn Chapel, on Easter Tuesday.

The purport of 'Maiden Life, as it is and as it might be' (London: Masters), is sufficiently indicated by its title. It is an excellent little tract, which may be very beneficially circulated in many quarters.

Mr. Lathbury's pamphlet, 'Facts and Fictions of the Bicentenary; a Sketch from 1640 to 1662,' not only exposes palpable fictions, but also contains hard facts, which the insidious promoters of the Bicentenary will find it more easy to evade and ignore than to answer. This cheap and useful pamphlet is published by the 'Bristol Church Defence Association,' and is to be had at Wertheim and Co. We would also recommend, from the same publishers, Mr. Clifford's lecture on a cognate subject, 'The Liberation Society; and to what do its principles tend?' Equally valuable is 'The Sufferings of the Church and the Intolerance of Dissent: a

Plain Statement of Facts (London: Masters), compiled by two English clergymen.

The Abbé Glaire, if we mistake not, Dean of the Faculty of Theology of Paris, and author of an 'Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament,' 'Les Livres Saints vengés,' 'Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum,' 'Principes de Grammaire Arabe,' and other learned works, has undertaken a French translation of the Bible, of which a first instalment—the New Testament—has recently appeared (Paris: Jouby). This work possesses this grand and interesting peculiarity—it is the first French translation of the Bible ever authorized by the Church of Rome. Of course, it is made from the Vulgate: of course, also, before receiving the sanction of the congregation of the Index, it had to undergo certain modifications and corrections. Whether they were as important as those made in Bouillet's well-known Dictionary, once put into the Index, but afterwards sanctioned, on the author's consenting to such corrections as the substitution of 'le célèbre Arnaud' for 'le grand Arnaud,' we are not told. The Abbé Glaire informs us that it was his original intention to republish the De Sacy's version with important changes, but that he subsequently abandoned the design, and decided upon giving a completely new translation. We have not examined very closely the version of the New Testament now before us, but it seems very literal and correct, though it lacks the grace and polished elegance of De Sacy's. We are scarcely able to judge from the instalment now published, but we think we should prefer De Sacy's to Glaire's version, while, on the other hand, Glaire's appears certainly preferable to De Genoude's. M. Glaire has here and there added a few notes in elucidation of the text. When the whole Bible has been published, we may perhaps return to it.

'The Codex Sinaiticus.' From inquiries made at the convent of S. Catharine, Mount Sinai, in the month of February last, it appears that the monks of that convent agree in stating that the above MS. was there from time immemorial. Prof. Tischendorf, they say, came fortified with requests and guarantees from the Grand Duke Constantine, the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, and other high personages, to have the MS. as a loan. They (the monks) affirm that they have guarantees for its safe return: but the subject is a sore one with them, and the librarian evidently does not put implicit confidence in the guarantees.

Mr. G. W. Cox's 'Tale of the Great Persian War' (Longman) is a worthy sequel to his 'Tales from the Greek Mythology,' to which we called attention about a year ago, being framed on the same plan, but on a larger scale, and with a view to an older class of readers. The conception of the book is a very good one, and well executed. In the first 230 pages Mr. Cox combines into a consecutive narrative those parts of Herodotus which belong to the Persian War, omitting all the less relevant digressions. He wisely confines himself to the resources of our old English language, 'pure and undefiled,' to translate the epic simplicity of the 'Father of History.' In the excursions which form the latter half of the book, historical and philosophical questions of deep interest, on the religious and

political aspect of the history, are handled in a way likely to extend Mr. Cox's reputation as a scholar. His remarks, if not always conclusive nor always free from an undue leaning to the *destructive* school, are always suggestive, and contribute materially towards the solution of some questions which underlie the controversy of the day in many of its phases; questions which commence with the credibility of ancient records, and pass on to the real character of the past, and its true relation to ourselves. We may add, that the 'Great Persian War' will prove especially useful to persons who are debarred by their ignorance of the language from approaching the treasures of Greek literature in their original beauty.

The 'apples of gold in pictures of silver,' are naturally suggested by the appearance of beautiful form and typography applied to words well worthy of such embellishment. A new and much enlarged edition of Mr. Bright's 'Ancient Collects' has very properly received from the publishers (Messrs. J. H. and Jas. Parker) this attention. It is, in every sense, a very beautiful book; and when we consider how few Christians are really capable of throwing their own aspirations into fitting words, of avoiding irreverence and false doctrine, without falling into stiffness and formality, or into weak prolixity and 'vain repetitions,' it is a great privilege to be able to obtain, in so convenient a form, a rich and varied collection of devotions so sound, terse, and majestic in their simplicity, to say nothing of their time-hallowed associations. We have much pleasure in recommending this new edition as an admirable gift-book alike for clergy or laity.

Two valuable discourses against Neologian error, by the Rev. P. G. Medd (who, like Mr. Bright, is a Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford), have been published by request (J. H. and Jas. Parker). They treat respectively of the 'Christian Meaning of the Psalms,' and 'The Supernatural Character and Spiritual Discernment of Christian Truth.' The University Pulpit, from which they were preached, seems to need (and happily obtains) some such counterbalance as these thoughtful and well-balanced pieces of argument. They are singularly free from any violence of statement or misrepresentation of the tendencies of rationalism; and this negative feature is well calculated to lend all the more weight to reasonings not easily to be gainsayed, and set forth in an attractive manner.

Mr. Philip Freeman's 'Vol. II. of Principles of Divine Service' (J. H. and J. Parker) is at length published.

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1862.

ART. I.—*Conference on Missions held in 1860 at Liverpool, including the Papers read, the Deliberations, and the Conclusions reached; with a comprehensive Index, showing the various matters brought under review.* Edited by the SECRETARIES TO THE CONFERENCE. Nineteenth Thousand, Revised. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21, Berners Street. 1860.

CERTAINLY one of the least satisfactory notes or marks of the Christian religion in this present age, if we view it in its more popular aspects, so to speak, is the ignorance which prevails in any one section of the Church concerning other sections or branches of the one really world-wide universal community.

That the East should be divided from the West—the West at disunion with itself—we seem to accept this as a matter of course, but we know that it was not so of old. We take up so easily accessible a book as Eusebius, let us say. One of the very first things which arrests our attention is the wonderful system of intercommunication which we find to have existed amongst the most distant portions of the Catholic Church. And we perceive that the intercommunication was at once a result of the Church's real unity, and a consequence and an evidence both, of a *felt* communion of saints. Of the Church herself was it spoken:—
'So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how.'¹ But in a subordinate sense the words may well apply to that all but absolutely perfect system by which the Church in one land made known all its more important transactions, its synodical decrees, its decisions and excommunications, its sufferings and martyrdoms, its triumphs and missions, and its victories, to the Church in every other. What is so wonderful is, that we nowhere read of the upgrowth of this system as a system, pro-

¹ S. Mark iv. 26, 27.

moted and recommended by the advice or suggestion of such as would now be called leading men: but we find it everywhere in practical operation as a thing of course. Was a heresiarch, or an unclean member, cut off from the sound and living body in the wilds of Pontus, or brought back to the faith in an out-of-the-way city of Arabia Petræa, the excision and the restoration were with all speed made known to the occupants of the great patriarchal thrones, and in due course they became known to all whom they might concern, from the worshippers in the rude churches of the British and Irish Celts to the Christians who revered S. Thomas as their apostle on the coast of India; and from the nomade tribes of Scythia to the believers who lived by hunting at the sources of the Nile. Does an apostolic Bishop of Antioch contend like a glorious athlete as he was against the powers of darkness, wrestling with wild beasts, and with men yet more wild and cruel than they, the tidings are handed on from Church to Church, and from city to city, until they reach the shores of Gaul. So, on the other hand, if men in that same Gaul manifest an endurance under persecution, and exhibit a heroism altogether superhuman, and if women surpass even men in the splendour of their martyr triumph, the news is speedily conveyed to gladden and animate the mother Churches of the East.

It would be a most interesting task to investigate fully the whole system of the epistolary intercommunion of the early Church, dividing it into two chief branches—1st. Encyclical letters, giving account of synodical or quasi-synodical action: 2d. The letters of individuals, chiefly of bishops, or of Churches communicating to other Churches intelligence of matters of interest which had befallen them, and sometimes conveying exhortation or reproof. The model upon which the first were framed was evidently the report of the proceedings in that First Council of Jerusalem, of which we read, ‘And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.’¹

The type of the latter class would be the Epistles of S. Paul, and other apostles and apostolic men. We are apt to think that the words of Daniel, ‘Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased,’² are having their first accomplishment in this nineteenth century society, but the more we study the records of the Primitive Church the more shall we be convinced that they have had an earlier and more perfect *religious* fulfilment. And all this is still more wonderful when

¹ Acts xv. 23.

² Dan. xii. 4.

we reflect that this communication was carried on in times of the most frightful persecutions, when bishops and clergy were frequently proscribed by law, and hunted like wild beasts—when, moreover, there was no organized postal system, and when great public men like Pliny had to employ the services of their slaves or freedmen as special messengers, or else to rely upon the casual visits of friends to convey their letters to their correspondents.

It is obvious that we in the present day live in an entirely different state of Christian society. Not only are the three great communions—Greek, Roman, and Anglican—opposed to one another, and isolated each to itself, but they are for the most part ignorant each of the other's faith, ritual, and discipline, still more of their internal history. Thus, to repeat a story which has been told before: when a well-known Anglican took a commendatory letter from the late Archbishop of Canterbury to the then Patriarch of Constantinople, and after he had stated that it was an autograph of the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, he was thrown into utter consternation by the reply of the Patriarch, '*And who is he?*'

Almost the only point of contact now between the Churches is their mutual anathemas. The Council of Trent has nothing but '*anathema sit*' for the minutest, often for the merest verbal divergence from her statements of doctrine. The Church of England endeavours, in her Thirty-nine Articles, to fasten the charge of '*blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits*,' of '*repugnance to the plain words of Scripture*,' of '*giving occasion to many superstitions*' upon certain Romish doctrines. The only occasion upon which she makes mention of the Apostolic Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, is to force her clergy into subscribing that they '*have erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith*.' We do not know that our Reformers were remarkable for their knowledge of geography, otherwise we might all have had to set our hand to the proposition that the Churches of Axum and Nubia, of Mtskétha and Georgia, had erred with all the rest. Any how, the charge is rather a sweeping one; and it would not be very surprising if the Orientals, perusing the Book of Common Prayer with which the Thirty-nine Articles are usually bound up, should view us with a suspicious eye, or say '*Timeo Anglos et libros ferentes*.'

We hear the remark, until we are fain to accept it from very weariness, that the cessation of the means of intercommunion of which we have been speaking, as well doubtless of every other good thing which has ceased in these latter ages, is fully made up by the institution of the periodical press. This, however, we are

bound to question, and we do it honestly and conscientiously upon the following grounds. We may admit, as a truism, that the press is most useful and valuable as a means of conveying information. But wherein the press is deficient is, that it cannot in the nature of things advance beyond this, beyond the function of informing. Many thousands of isolated Christians receive their magazine or their religious newspaper by the book post, some morning, we will say, after they have sat down to their comfortable, or their luxurious breakfast, as it may happen, and they read of the conflicts and the struggles, the toils and the sorrows of the blessed Spouse of the Lamb in far distant lands, for Him contending Whose she is; and as they read they are at the best perhaps pleasantly excited, just sufficiently to give a zest to appetite, or to afford a useful aid to digestion. They read, and lay down their paper, and proceed about their usual daily avocations. They have become acquainted with a certain amount of interesting information, and there the matter ends. There are no visible tangible results. There is no appreciable effect upon practice. Now what seems to us to be wanted is some method by which intelligence of the state of Christian Missions throughout the world may be conveyed to Christians at home as a *collective* body, as members most really and most closely united with every other member, so that this missionary intelligence and these missionary records may influence the Church in any one place as a collective body, according to the definition given in the Nineteenth Article. The Church herself must take an interest in missions. Such interest must be co-extensive with the Church, so that Churchmen and interest in missions may become really correlative terms. The Bishop of Lincoln expressed himself in his recent charge to the effect that he did not consider the organization of any parish complete unless the duty of supporting foreign missions were in some way set before the people. Yet there are even now thousands of parishes, and probably millions of the laity, who do literally *nothing* for this great work. It is not more than about twelve years since that only half the parishes of England and Wales were connected with either the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel or the Church Missionary Society, by the existence of parochial or district associations. The number is now probably somewhat increased, but not very much. If a bishop sends, as the Bishop of Lincoln does, a pastoral letter to his clergy, to be read in every church of the diocese after the Nicene Creed, by means of which an opportunity is given to each congregation of contributing to the support of some society which makes home work its object, such as the Incorporated Society for Building Churches and Chapels, or the Curates' Aid

Society, the probability is that nine-tenths of the clergy will comply with his lordship's desire. If, on the other hand, he merely pen a sentence or two in his charge, hundreds will hear or read, and nothing will follow; no action will be taken; the subject will quickly drop out of mind.

The Mission Union of S. Augustine has already taken one important step in the right direction, by forwarding interesting letters and intelligence, from time to time, to each associate of the Union. Mr. Green, Principal of the Church Missionary Society's Institute, Islington, has some very excellent remarks upon the method of bringing missionary subjects before a congregation as a whole. He spoke as follows at the Liverpool Conference, whose proceedings we are reviewing:—

‘When he (Mr. Green) had charge of a parish, some time ago, he was in the habit of directing the thoughts of his people to missionary subjects on the Sabbath-day, at stated intervals, sometimes speaking of one mission and sometimes of another; and he could truly say that much more interest was excited whenever that Sabbath came round than by the ordinary ministrations of his Church: for thus a pleasing variety was imparted to those ministrations, at the same time that he was carrying the introduction of the missionary element prominently into the pulpit. The effect of this and of other measures which he adopted with the same object in view was the formation of a missionary association, and from 30% which they raised in the first year they went on increasing, from time to time, until in the last year that he was there (ten years altogether) they were able to send up to the funds of the Parent Society a sum of 200%. He thought that this was mainly due to the giving of information from the pulpit in the way already referred to. He should state further, that the congregation consisted almost entirely of operatives, and contained only some half-dozen persons of moderate or affluent means.’—P. 77.

Would that we might see a further development of such a system. Would that we might witness our bishops commending missions and missionary labourers to the Church as a whole, bringing formally and definitely before each diocese the work of the Church abroad, and connecting it thus by some tangible link with the Church at home. There is one Rubric of the Church of England which connects her very really in theory with that usage of the early Church of which we have spoken:—‘Then shall briefs, citations, and excommunications be read.’ This Rubric, although fallen into almost complete practical desuetude, is capable of great and indefinite expansion. It is one of those things which God's providence has permitted to remain in the letter of the Church's law, though for ages in abeyance, until the time comes when they are found to stand a new generation in good stead, and to show that the Catholic Church, though she may change from age to age in outward unessential forms, yet knows not what it is ever to grow effete, or to lose her power of bringing forth out of her treasury things both new and old.

We have been led into making these remarks by the perusal of the recently published work on *Missions*, which stands at the head of this article. The publication we look upon, for several reasons, as a very remarkable one; not, indeed, because of any peculiar literary ability displayed in its composition, or for any new and particularly striking facts brought forward, or suggestions offered, but from the circumstance that so many men of note amongst the English, Scotch, and Irish Dissenters, together with so many Low Churchmen, should have taken part in the proceedings of the Conference, who evidently brought their best energies to bear upon making it a means of effectual good; as also for the conditions under which the record of their proceedings was published.

The work is a nicely got up, well-printed 8vo volume, containing some 450 pages. A copy was sent, free by post, to every clergyman whose address could be found; many received two copies; and a notice was issued, that any clergyman who happened to be omitted from this gratuitous distribution, should, upon forwarding his address, have a copy sent to him, post free.

We presume that copies would be given away to most Dissenting teachers, and to many others besides. Altogether, the gratuitous circulation could scarcely have been less than 20,000 copies. The price for which the book is sold is half a crown; to this sixpence must be added for postage. But it is obvious that the book could not be got up for the sum named; certainly not, if we judge by the prices charged by most Church booksellers. A book of that description in *Masters' catalogue* would be priced at the least from eight to ten shillings. But let us say that publishers' books are rather dear, still the work in question could not have been placed in the hands of the reader at a lower figure, including postage, than five shillings. This involves a total expenditure of the enormous sum for such a purpose of 5,000*l*. Whoever heard of any High Churchman, or combination of High Churchmen, raising the fifth part of such a sum for such an object? However, so it is. Let us honour zeal wherever we find it. Let us try, with our greater light, to have at least equal zeal, and thank God we know it will be better directed. Some clergymen we know to whom this book was sent quickly put it behind the fire. This we think a pity, because we have no doubt the committee of publication would have gladly forwarded postage stamps sufficient to restore it. We judge so from the following notice which accompanied the book:—

'Copies have been already supplied to various study, school, and public-institution libraries. Applications are coming daily for more. The Stewards,

therefore, earnestly beg the favour of early and liberal donations to their fund, through Messrs. Nisbet & Co. Berners Street, London.'

We will now proceed to say something of its contents. We will set before our readers the origin, nature, proceedings, and proposed objects of the Conference, in the language of the book itself:—

'The Conference on Christian Missions, the proceedings of which are described in the following pages, originated in a desire to have brethren brought together, who had reflected on the duty and the lukewarmness of the Churches in respect of Our Grand Commission; or who could contribute actual experiences; in order that, by their mutual consultations, all Christians of the United Kingdom might be stirred up to greater zeal, and to a more complete consecration of time, of effort, and of substance in this work of the Lord. In God's good providence facilities were presented, and readily embraced by a number of the officers and members of Missionary Committees in London and Edinburgh; who felt that after the many years of continuous missionary labour carried on in heathen lands; after the solid advance attained in some fields, and the great experience acquired in all, it would be well for the Directors, Secretaries, and Missionaries of all Societies and Churches, to obtain an opportunity of meeting together and conferring together about their common work. It was felt that it must prove a lasting benefit for them to examine in detail the working of their various missionary agencies, to compare their different plans, and to throw into a common stock the results of that valuable experience which they have earned hardly upon the very fields of heathenism. It was felt, that while all must find abundant means of adding to their own knowledge, through the information given by brethren, all must be cheered by the tokens of missionary success; all must be stimulated to greater zeal in the service of Christ, the common Lord; and all must be bound in closer and more loving sympathy with brethren toiling for the same grand end.'

The list of the members of this Conference is noteworthy, both on account of those who did take part in it, as well as for the omission of many names which we should confidently have expected, but which were not included in it. In analysing the catalogue, we find that of the 126 members of which it was composed, about 43 were Presbyterians of many different denominations; 33 belonged to the Church of England; about 10 we were not able to identify, and the remainder, 40, included some of a great variety of sects—Baptists, Independents, Wesleyans, and Moravians. It will thus be seen that the Presbyterians—who hitherto have engaged least in missions to the heathen, who have had, beyond all comparison, less success than Wesleyans, Baptists, or Independents, to say nothing of the Moravians—outnumbered all these sects put together. It may be that in the division of labour, which it seems to have been one of the objects of the Conference to promote, the Presbyterians are ready to furnish eloquent or fluent speakers for home purposes; other sects money and labourers for the work abroad. How this may be we know not. The fact is as we have stated it. Twenty-four clergymen of the Church, including the well-

known names of Baylee, Birks, Green, Hebert, and Stowell, took part in the proceedings.

One really eminent layman was present throughout, Lieut.-Colonel Edwardes, one who has well earned a right to be heard upon the subject of Missions, and whose advice and suggestions are entitled to be received with the most respectful attention. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was represented by a single name, the Rev. Dr. O'Meara, who is described as Missionary Chaplain to the Red Indians on Lake Huron, and Superintendent of Indian Missions for the Church of England there. The name of Dr. O'Meara is one quite familiar to us, as that of a devoted and successful missionary. We have followed him with much interest from time to time, as we have perused the reports which have been published of his labours and journeyings. Not very long ago he received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the University of Dublin, in testimony of his zeal and devotedness, especially, we believe, for his most useful translations of portions of Holy Scripture, and of the Book of Common Prayer, into the language of the Ojibbwa Indians. We had always looked upon Dr. O'Meara as being a good Churchman; we really do not know that we had any definite reason for thinking so, but we had the impression. We were, accordingly, for a long time at a loss how he had come to form one of so motley a group, but the mystery was fully cleared up when we came to page 144, and found him speaking as follows:—

'The Rev. Dr. O'Meara said, it occurred to him that when they spoke of a vernacular literature, they did not mean merely certain English sounds, represented by certain vernacular sounds, but referred also to the style of thought. They did not go for vernacular English to a classical library, but to such books as *Ryle's tracts*, than which, he believed, there was nothing more excellent. He had translated tracts into the language of the North American Indians, but the author of those tracts would not know them if they were translated back again.'

We wish we could think that the eulogy here pronounced bore reference merely to the style and not to the worse than questionable teaching of 'Ryle's Tracts.' Dr. O'Meara does not say in so many words that he has translated 'Ryle's Tracts' into Ojibbwa, but we suppose he means us to draw that conclusion. We know that he has been assisted in his labours by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. We believe it would strike our readers as something novel to find a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel translating 'Ryle's Tracts' into the language of the Red Indians at the expense of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Let us take as a specimen Mr. Ryle's tract, 'Are you regenerate?'

We think we have met with one bearing that title, in which the author labours hard to prove that baptism has nothing whatever to do with regeneration. And we should like to ask Dr. O'Meara whether, supposing him to have put, together with this tract of Mr. Ryle's, a fairly and literally translated copy of the baptismal service of the Church of England, into the hands of his Red Indians, those same poor Red Indians have not been very considerably mystified? We can only hope, for the sake of all parties concerned, that it is of the *matter* of Mr. Ryle's tracts that Dr. O'Meara speaks when he says, 'that he had translated tracts into the language of the North American Indians, but the author of those tracts would not know them if they were translated back again.'

The President or Chairman of the Conference was a Major-General Alexander. We are not at all aware whether or not General Alexander professes to be a Churchman. But it does strike us as something strange that a layman should have been, by unanimous consent, chosen to preside over a gathering of which Lord Shaftesbury said afterwards, at a great public meeting in the town of Liverpool, with which the proceedings were wound up:

'I must say that it appears to me something like an Ecumenical Council of the dominions of her Majesty Queen Victoria (hear, hear), and I trust that it will be quite as pure in spirit, wiser in conduct, and happier in issue, than most of the Ecumenical Councils that have been held in other times (laughter).'

By the way, what could have been the meaning of this laughter? Did it seem to the audience so very funny that Lord Shaftesbury should speak about Ecumenical Councils at all, even to sneer at them? Or was there something in his lordship's tone and gestures which were provocative of Liverpool Protestant risibility, but which were incapable of being transferred to the printed Report? General Alexander seems to have occupied the chair as his rightful position, but he does not appear to have taken the lead in the devotional proceedings with which the business of each day commenced and terminated.

Reference was made upon one occasion by Mr. Green to the Acts of the Apostles:—

'Looking at the Acts of the Apostles, which was from the beginning to the end a missionary record, he asked if they had ever considered how large a proportion the Acts of the Apostles bore to the whole of the New Testament? They would find that it was one-eighth part of the entire book which was thus taken up by a missionary record.'—P. 76.

We wonder that it did not occur to the recollection of this excellent clergyman that we never hear of the College of the Apostles having been presided over by a layman. We would

ask him to reflect for a moment how very strange it would seem if we read of even so excellent a layman as that good 'old disciple Mnason,' with whom S. Paul lodged, taking the chair at a gathering of the Apostles or their immediate successors. And let it be observed that the laity of those days were often, in all probability, inspired to speak with tongues and to work miracles. Is it not then unscriptural to appoint laymen to preside over a conference composed mainly of clergy, now that the latter have only their apostolic commission to rest upon as the warrant for their authoritative enunciation of the gospel of the grace of God; now that neither they nor the laity lay claim to any miraculous powers? But the truth is, we have often been amazed at the way in which Dissenters and Low Churchmen do practically ignore apostolic authority. They talk much of the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture, but as soon as they find the letter of Scripture against them, they are too often ready to turn it aside, and make it bend, not, indeed, to the unanimous traditional consent of the Catholic Church for 1,800 years, but to the non-natural interpretation of a Wesley, a Simeon, or a Venn. We do honestly believe that the way in which the so-called Evangelical party have dealt with and expounded Holy Scripture has had more to do with evoking the spirit which has produced 'Essays and Reviews' than any other single thing. The Evangelicals, we do not hesitate to say, have too often played fast and loose with Scripture. We could give an immense number of cases in point, but we will content ourselves with one or two. Not long since a well-known Evangelical clergyman, the Rev. Barton Bouchier, published a work to which he prefixed the following motto: 'Unus Augustinus præ mille Patribus, unus Paulus præ mille Augustinis, Unus Christus præ mille Paulis.' 'Unus Pater præ mille Bartonis Bouchieriis,' would have been, we think, so far complete. But what we wish our readers to notice is the singular confusion which such an expression as 'Unus Christus,' &c. betrays with regard to any possible orthodox theory of the inspiration of the Word of God. If S. Paul's Epistles be *θεόπνευσται*, then are his words really of exactly the same weight and the same authority for the establishment of *doctrine* as the words of Jesus Christ, our adorable God and Saviour Himself. All this shows us how very dangerous is the want of exact theological training. Evangelicals quote such sayings as we have mentioned with pious intentions, doubtless. The intention was to exalt the Person of Christ, but such pious ignorance depreciates the office and work of the Holy Ghost, and gives unscrupulous men just the opening they want to introduce the whole cycle of neology, ideology, or what not. Somehow, when we read

'Essays and Reviews,' we seem to be following a train of thought which has been long familiar to us as running in a subtle under-current through very much of the popular Low Church and Dissenting literature of the last twenty or thirty years. We will give another instance of what we mean. We ourselves were once discussing some theological questions with an Independent teacher of some mark. In the course of the argument we happened to refer to the conduct of the Apostles in choosing S. Matthias in the room of Judas, to which our opponent immediately replied, 'Oh! that proves nothing. I am of opinion that 'the Apostles, in that instance, were labouring under a mistake. 'It was clearly never God's intention that any vacancy which 'occurred in the original Twelve should be filled up.' We need scarcely add that this drew our discussion to a close. But these were the very words of a highly intelligent and thinking man, and one who would call himself, and who would be called by the Evangelicals, an orthodox Dissenting minister, separated from his brethren of the Church merely upon the trifling unessential points of Episcopacy and a Church Establishment. We would only ask what more could Mr. Jowett or Dr. Williams possibly say? We have been led into making these remarks in consequence of the following speech of a Mr. William Shaw, Wesleyan Missionary from South Africa, which we give exactly as it stands in the corrected, authoritative Report of the proceedings of the Conference:—

'I am not so sure that even the Apostles themselves, when they went forth with the gift of tongues, were in every instance able to speak with the correct pronunciation and exact style of the people among whom they were sent to labour. I very much doubt whether that noble protest which S. Paul made upon Mars' Hill at Athens, against the polytheism of that period, and in which the assertion was made of the power and goodness of the one great God—I very much doubt whether that protest was uttered in language exactly such as would have been used by the celebrated orators of that famous city. (Cheers.) I suspect that there would be something of an uncouthness, and of a foreign accent, even in St. Paul's utterance (laughter); for it is in that way that I understand the remarks made by the Corinthians who were opposed to him, when they said that his "speech was contemptible."'

Now we do not for a moment mean to say that there is any absolute heretical meaning conveyed of necessity in these words of Mr. Shaw. But what we feel is, that the entire theological school of whom we are now speaking have allowed themselves time out of mind to talk and write about inspired writings and inspired men in a jocose, familiar, irreverent manner. If S. Paul spoke on Mars' Hill as he was moved by the Holy Ghost—if to S. Paul were applicable upon that, as upon other occasions, the words of our Saviour Christ,¹ 'But when they

¹ Mark xiii. 11.

'shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost,' then was the tone of Mr. Shaw's remarks, to say the very least, highly unbecoming; and still more unbecoming was it that they should be received by such an assembly with a burst of laughter. And we feel there is all the more danger to religion when the same men, ignorant, for the most part, of sound criticism, and certainly of exact theological science, profess, as they do, to set up the idol of Verbal Inspiration, the true force of which they know not, and whose meaning we never knew them able to define.

If the Conference was in any way remarkable for the presence of those gentlemen who took part in its deliberations, it was out of all proportion more remarkable for the absence of many who were not there. No single Bishop, English, Irish, or Colonial, is to be found on the List of Members. Whether none were invited to be present we are, of course, unable to say; but we cannot refrain from asking where were the Barings, and the Bickersteths, and the Pelhams? where the Dalys and the Plunkets, the Barkers, the Ryans, and the Cotterells? Again, there was not a single Church dignitary present higher than a Canon. In the name of Evangelical Alliance Unity, what could have become of our Closes, and our Goodes, and our Elliotts, and other eminent Protestant champions who are now to be found in such numbers adorning the highest and most lucrative posts of the 'Venerable Establishment'? By the way, it has often and often struck us, and we have never been able to obtain any solution of our difficulty; if 'the Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants, what can or ought they to have to do with deans and chapters, with cathedrals and cathedral stalls, with canons and prebendaries, precentors and choristers? Would it not be more consistent with pure and simple Protestantism to do away with such things entirely, all except the revenues and emoluments, which might be applied to the support of a largely increased staff of Scripture-readers, or to keep up that which seems to be becoming quite one of the institutions of the present day, united prayer-meetings, in which all denominations join, and which take place in town-halls, and corn-exchanges, and theatres, for the present, we suppose, until such time as our cathedrals and parish churches can be made available for the purpose?

On the whole, the Conference seems to have presented the spectacle of a tolerably happy family, with the exception of a little occasional sparring, as we shall see presently. Their constant mutual congratulations upon their unanimity, and

cordial fraternization, reminded strongly of an incident which befel a friend of ours not long since. He was travelling in a railway carriage with two companions. One seemed to be a respectable middle-class farmer's wife, the other proved to be a Primitive Methodist, more generally and popularly known as a Ranter preacher. Not long after the train had started, he was addressed by his female fellow-traveller with the interrogation if he were not the Wesleyan minister residing at —? 'No! 'ma'am,' he replied; 'I am the Primitive Methodist preacher at —.' 'Oh! indeed, sir,' she said, 'it does seem a pity that there should be so many divisions in the Christian Church, and that we could not all belong to the same denomination.' 'Well, ma'am,' was the reply, 'I consider that all the different denominations may be compared to regiments of one vast army, all fighting under the one captain, and all marching on to victory under the one ensign;' with much more to the same effect, being evidently the reproduction of a stock sermon. His female auditor appeared to like these sentiments very much, and replied in a kind of meditative tone, 'Yes, sir, yes, that is very true; or we might compare them to a great number of railway carriages, all drawn by the one steam-engine.' She did not, however, make her comparison complete by giving a mystical interpretation of her bold metaphor, so far as the steam-engine was concerned.

An amusing instance occurs quite incidentally at p. 218, of the light in which the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel would be viewed by the members of the Conference. A Mr. Behari Lal Singh, who is a native Hindoo missionary of the Scotch Free Kirk, was speaking about the employment of native agents, and of the salaries which they ought to receive, which he was of opinion should vary according to the moral and physical qualifications of the agents themselves. The actual pay, he said, which the highest class of native preachers received was betwixt 100 and 150 rupees a month, which was much less than most of the English missionaries received, but nearly equal to what his friends of the General Baptist Society and American Free-will Brethren get; and then he adds in a note:

'Although his remarks are confined to the native agents of *Evangelical* Missionary Societies, yet he sees no harm in stating that some few of the native clergy of the Propagation Society receive higher pay than any of their brethren in connexion with other Missionary Societies.'

The italics are our own, but they show pretty clearly that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel would be considered a non-Evangelical Society.

We said there was a little sparring occasionally. A Mr.

Mullens, who is described as a missionary of the London Missionary Society, and who was one of the Secretaries of the Conference, spoke very wisely and very pertinently upon two or three occasions upon the impolicy of transferring the minutiae of Church organization at home, and the peculiarities of a variety of religious denominations to the native Churches in heathen lands. More especially he animadverted upon part of the system which is pursued by the missionaries of the Free Kirk of Scotland in their ordination of native pastors. Major Alexander led the way by some remarks which he made at the opening Session :—

‘He would ask whether it was a necessary thing that the very systems amidst which we had grown up; systems that came out of the struggles, contentions, and controversies of the Reformation; systems that had arisen in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and during the distracting times of the reigns of the Stuarts, which were manifestly imperfect in themselves, though perhaps the best that could be adapted to the states of mind and difficult circumstances, in which men were then placed—whether such systems are what we should take and fix, like cast-iron matrices, in which to mould without necessary adaptations, the varying minds and circumstances of American Indians, Africans, Asiatics, and the inhabitants of the numerous islands of the Pacific? It was important to see whether we could not detect in these very systems causes of hindrance. From his own experience, he was sure we could; and, therefore, on this subject there ought to be the freest and boldest expression of opinion, founded upon experience, and guided by the Word of God. (Hear, hear.)’

Mr. Mullens gave some practical examples of the mistakes which he thought it desirable to avoid :—

‘I wish that we should . . . look at some things in our own systems, of which, it seems to me, we ought to keep clear, when we carry the Gospel and transplant it in another land, amongst another people. We profess to carry the very Gospel of Christ to heathen lands, its full doctrine, its active life. We have done so largely; but have we done nothing more? Let me mention a case in illustration of my meaning.

I was present some few years ago, when, in Calcutta, three excellent native converts were ordained as missionaries of the Free Church of Scotland. After the usual questions had been put relating to their personal piety, their consecration to the ministry, and their doctrinal views, they were asked, if I remember rightly, whether they assented to the principles contained in the Deed of Demission of 1843, by which the original ministers and elders of the Free Church severed their connexion with the Established Church of Scotland. I thought at the time: What have these young men *directly* to do with that document? Indirectly, of course, they are concerned with it. They have been instructed, converted, received into membership, and now ordained in connexion with that branch of Christ’s Church. Nothing can be more right than to take proper guarantees that they possess the spirituality of character, the purity of doctrine, and personal consecration, that should rule every minister of Christ in every country; that they should possess those elements of spiritual Christianity which are essential in every climate and nation; but why should young Bengali Christians commit themselves to certain transactions which have occurred in the history of Scottish Christianity?

Again: when in Tinnevely, in February, 1853, I saw the four native brethren who had just been ordained by the Bishop of Madras as clergymen of the

Church of England; the first of that valuable band, who have since been appointed pastors of the churches both in Tinnevely and among the Syrian districts of Travancore. I understood that in preparing them for their work, their valued instructor, Mr. Sargent, had carried them through a course of instruction similar to that which clergymen usually follow in England; had given them lectures in Tamil, embodying *Pearson on the Creed*, *Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles*, and the like; and that beyond this, on their ordination, though judicious alterations were allowed in their standards of knowledge, they had been required to affix their signatures to the same Articles of Subscription as those signed by clergymen in England.—Pp. 285, 286.

As we read on we found that first one and then another demurred not a little to Mr. Mullens' way of putting things. Mr. Mullens is an Independent or Congregationalist; and the idea seemed very prevalent that the result which would ensue upon a practical carrying into effect of his suggestions would be to bring all the grist to the Congregational mill, which would never do.

In the name of the English Church, we sincerely thank Mr. Fox, a clergyman of Durham, for the very hearty stand which he made on behalf of Bishop Pearson's great work.

'The Rev. G. F. Fox, of Durham, sympathised with some of the remarks of the last speaker, especially in reference to the introduction of technicalities into native Churches. But, in defence of Mr. Sargent, he would like to say, that a book like *Pearson on the Creed* could hardly be classed among the technical: for he doubted whether, if you wished to instruct a young man in Christianity generally, you could well give him a more desirable text-book to study; a book entirely independent of technicalities, and one which he was sure Mr. Mullens would appreciate as much as any one in the room. He admitted that technicalities ought to be avoided, whilst every Church may naturally exercise its own judgment as to the mode in which Christianity ought to be taught.'

As Mr. Mullens pointed his moral by a special allusion to the Free Kirk, so we find that the Presbyterians were the most earnest in their repudiation of any such undenominational ideas, if we may use the expression. They probably had not read in vain the history of the Great Rebellion, and remembered how the ardent zeal of the Presbyterian Covenanters succumbed before the yet fiercer fanaticism of Cromwell and his Independent Ironside troopers. A Dr. Tweedie of Edinburgh rose and spoke as follows:—

'Our brother, Mr. Mullens, had not added dignity to the principles distinctive of the Free Church, by ranking them among technicalities or external things. That Church regarded them as vital things; and could not easily leave them out of sight. At the same time, the mode of ordination referred to by Mr. Mullens was appointed by the General Assembly; and the Presbytery of Calcutta had, consequently, no power to alter the forms. Their power was merely executive. If those who were ordained had conscientious scruples on the subject, that would modify the case: but, judging from his correspondence with at least some of those who had been ordained, the distinctive tenets set forth in the documents named by our brother were held by them as firmly as by our Free Church ministers at home.'

Mr. Mullens, whose remarks had given the first occasion for all these searchings of heart, seemed quite hurt that he should be suspected of wanting to bring grist to his own denomination; so he made an explanation which was no doubt quite satisfactory, and then all metaphorically shook hands and made it up, and were good friends ever after.

'The Rev. J. Mullens said: May I be allowed a word or two of explanation. I must have spoken very indistinctly, if it be thought that I wish to make my brethren Congregationalists, or to lay down, for their adoption, principles which would have the effect of landing them in Congregationalism. Such a thing never entered my head; and such principles of Christian union never came from my heart. I wish to see our systems applied in the most elastic way: and their essentials separated from their local, technical, and historical elements. My friend, Dr. Tweedie, does me a little injustice in thinking I class the principles of the Deed of Demission among the technicalities of the Free Church. Not at all: the principles are very grave ones; but the circumstances of the case form part of that history of Scotch Christianity, which has made the Church what it is. The native brethren, when ordained, may justly be committed to the result, without being asked to commit themselves to the process by which that result was produced.'

Many Churchmen we know are apt to take a gloomy view of this fraternization of all sects and parties, especially for missionary objects—Catholics, whether Roman or Anglican, being alone excluded. There is unquestionably a disheartening aspect in which all this may be viewed. But is there nothing also to cheer? We think there is. The philosophical student of Church history will see that something very similar has happened already fourteen or fifteen centuries ago. Protestant sects are really in the present day, whether we know it or not, making wonderful efforts for the conversion of heathen nations. We feel confident that Churchmen will wake up some day and find the countless myriads of the East, so far as they are not members of the Church of Rome, leavened with Protestantism in one or other of its more popular forms. There are not wanting a few faint tokens of this even now. And we think it impossible to deny, nor would we wish to deny, that there are the fruits of the Spirit to be found in many of the converts of those who 'are not of us.'

The authentic accounts of the Karens, a very numerous tribe in the Burmese empire, amongst whom the Antipædobaptist missionaries from America have had most wonderful success, read like the records of the Primitive Church:—

'Lieut. S. Flood Page said, that it was with very great deference that he ventured to address the Conference. His apology for doing so was, that several members of Conference were anxious to know something of the work going on amongst the Karens; and that a recent speaker had expressed the greatest desire to know how it was that the Karen Churches were, to so great an extent, self-supporting; and how they were able to govern themselves. He had been

stationed in Burmah for eighteen months; sixteen months of that time at Tounghoo, the chief station of the Karen Mission in Eastern Burmah. During that time he knew the American Baptist missionary, and some native Karen catechists. One main reason that the work had progressed more in the Tounghoo district than in almost any other place, he thought, was owing to the fact, that there the Karens, though part of the Burmese empire, never acknowledged more than a very slight allegiance to the Burmese Government. Each village governed itself by means of a headman. Doubtless, this system of local government had enabled them to govern themselves in ecclesiastical matters. With reference to the Karen Churches being self-supporting, for years there had been a tradition among them that a white man would come with a book; and whenever they saw a white man with a book, they were anxious and ready to listen to him. The Rev. Mr. Whittaker was quite unable to provide as many catechists as the different villages were desirous of supporting. The Karens build the huts for the catechists to live in, and furnish them with clothes and food; and this is all the pay the catechists get. From May until December it was absolutely necessary that the Karen Churches should govern themselves; for, owing to the rains, the jungles could not be penetrated by Europeans. The system followed by the American Baptist missionaries was to train catechists, and send these catechists as pioneers before them. The Rev. Mr. Whittaker, on one occasion, came to a village where a white face had never been seen, and out of the 300 inhabitants found 130 candidates for baptism: after examination, he baptized only a small number; the remainder, headed by the chief man of the village, followed him for fifteen miles, begging that they might be baptized. The Assistant-Commissioner of the district was, at one time, anxious that a man who valued the English system of government should go amongst the Karens, and prove to them the advantage of attaching themselves warmly to the English. The Commissioner sent for their teacher, by name Sau Quala, known as the "Karen Apostle," and offered him a salary equal to 300% a year to undertake the office. Sau Quala was not receiving one penny in the way of pay. He had no home of his own, no income, and knew not in the morning where he would sleep, or how he would live; yet he declined the office, saying, "Suppose I accept it, what will my countrymen say? Will they think I preach the Gospel for the sake of Jesus Christ, or because of the salary which I get from Government? No, I will not touch it." The wonderful success in this mission was doubtless to be very greatly ascribed to the fact that the Karens were without any religion, and were waiting for one; to their power of governing themselves; and to the system of making the natives pioneers of the Europeans: but it must be especially ascribed to this fact, that it had pleased Our Father in heaven that it should be so. And it was what we might have looked for when we remember the work and labour of love of God's devoted servants, Dr. and Mrs. Judson, and their able successors; when we recall the Karen martyrs hanging on the cross, refusing to deny the Lord that had died for them, and to the last preaching from the cross to the multitudes around them.—Pp. 307, 308.

Or read again the account of the native Malagache martyrs and confessors who had been converted to Christ by the Independents.

Mr. Mullens says:—

'We were told in very affecting terms by Dr. Tidman, the other day, to look at the poor island of Madagascar. More than twenty years ago the English missionaries were driven from that island by the unrighteous queen, and scarcely fifty native Christians were left behind. They possessed but very small portions of the Word of God, some little tracts, and a few hymns. They have been

bitterly and unrelentingly persecuted with Satanic cunning and Satanic hate. They have been fined, imprisoned, degraded, and made slaves; they have been poisoned by the tangena-water; they have been speared to death; they have been cast over lofty precipices; they have been burned at the stake, while the glorious rainbow arched the heavens and inspired them with more than mortal joy; they have given more than a hundred martyrs to the Church of Christ; but, far from being rooted out of the land, while, twenty years ago, when the persecution began, there were not fifty Christians on the island, it is believed that there are now at least 5,000: all of whom have been raised up by the special blessing of the Divine Spirit upon the teachings of native agents and the secret study of God's holy Word.²—P. 334.

The honest truth is, that the Protestant sects are beginning to count their converts in heathendom by hundreds of thousands; and they have very much of which they may be fairly proud. But what then? Suppose the heathen world does become Christianized after a Protestant form? Thus it may remain for a few score, it may be for a few hundred years; but ultimately the nations will be surely gathered in to some true, pure branch of the Catholic Church, and will enjoy all the blessings and miracles of grace of that sacramental system which is the corollary of the Incarnation of God the Son. Let us look at the history of the Church for about 150 years subsequent to the First Council of Nicæa. Every one knows how the Church was torn and distracted by heresies of every kind—how we became weary of the conflicting Councils of Arians and semi-Arians. Nothing but scenes of perpetual strife. All was turbulence, and turmoil, and uproar; crafty attempts to overthrow the Church's faith and pervert the unwary. And, what is very generally overlooked or ignored, the heretics were great and successful missionaries. The two mighty nations of the Goths and the Vandals were both converted to Arian Christianity. At one period not one nation or tribe of those who were destined to infuse new life and vigour into the decaying, utterly corrupt, and worthless society of the Old World, and to form the basis of the population of Christian Europe, were Catholics, with the single exception of the Franks. Yet by God's good providence they were all eventually reclaimed, and became far more zealous for the faith than ever they had opposed it. They grew at length into that most glorious mediæval Church which afforded in some measure a fulfilment of Isaiah's rapturous visions of the Bride of Christ—that Church whose like we shall scarcely see again on earth, at least not here in the West. But who can tell what may be yet in store for those far-off nations of the glowing, gorgeous East? If they, with hand, and heart, and soul, enslaved under the bondage of demons, could erect for devil worship, for the devil's glory, such mighty shrines as Elora, and Elephanta, and Orissa, what may they not do if they come to

throw the fervour of an Eastern imagination, and the warmth of an Eastern heart into love for the religion of Jesus, into devotion to the Cross of God? Col. Edwardes showed how religion enters into every action of a Hindoo's daily life:—

‘The native is constituted altogether differently from us: his mind is of a totally different construction. Whether he is a Hindoo or a Mahomedan, religion is to the Asiatic the very beginning and the end, the Alpha and the Omega, of his existence. Its fibres run through every act of his life. There is no feast, no fast, no event of happiness or sorrow in that man's family: he never eats or drinks, but in whatever he does, he does it to the glory of his god.’—P. 339.

And we have hope in this thought that surely the great bulk of modern Protestant sectaries are almost infinitely preferable to most of the ancient heretics. And it may well be that God's providence may so will it that those nations of the East shall first pass through the imperfect stage of these multitudinous Christian sects before they come to enjoy the full blessings and privileges which are to be found only in the bosom of the Catholic Church. We do not say that it will be so, but that it may be. And this ought to be a comfort to us. For looking back at the past, what could seem more disheartening, more hopeless even to the faithful of those days, than that the northern nations and tribes, with whom lay evidently the world's and the Church's future, should be almost universally poisoned with the fearful impiety of Arianism, as it were, in their very cradle. Yet we who know what was hidden then, can look back and see how Arianism passed away like the ‘dream of a night vision,’ and the nations who were its chief supporters became as to political influence ‘like the chaff of the summer threshing floors.’ We can see that it was but one little stage in the history of her who is a ‘mourner still,’ of her who must mourn and fast because her Bridegroom has been taken away from her; of her who is a mourner and a dweller in the wilderness, though she be ‘clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet.’

As the Arians baptized, we believe, for the most part in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, so did their converts become regenerate in the laver of baptism: and thus too it may well be that in process of time the millions of the East may become regenerate through the instrumentality of those who deny and disbelieve the grace of holy baptism. But let them once be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, and then we may believe that from those regenerate myriads the ever-adorable and all-glorious coequal Spirit of the Triune God will evolve, if we may use the expression, as the centuries pass on, saints and confessors, bishops and priests, doctors and virgins, such as they were of old. There may yet

come forth Eastern Breviaries of a thousand different families which shall enshrine as it were the loving adoration of Jesus in all the fervid imagery and the words of ruby fire of those Eastern tongues.

There has been a faint image of all this once before in that most widely-spread Nestorian Church of which such marvels have been told, and they scarcely less than the reality. But the time when it seemed good to the Father for the mighty ingathering had not yet come; and so the Churches of the East did not cast out the poison of heresy, but rather did their heresy spread like a gangrene until it ate out their whole spiritual life. They became dead branches fit for the burning. We may be mistaken, but we cannot help thinking that we can discern the dawning of a happier day for the Church in the East. Only let us not be impatient. Let us not forget that 'one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.' Let us not feel discouraged if it seem that what we know to be God's truth, as expounded by the Catholic Church, does not make much progress in its fulness and its integrity. For the future let us remember that the prophecies concerning the Church have never yet had their complete and perfect accomplishment: and, for the past, let us look at God's dealings with her in the time of the Arians, and in many another page of her history: and we shall feel that we too, in this our day and generation, may 'thank God and take courage.'

ART. II.—1. *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus sive Fragmenta Novi Testamenti e Codice Græco Parisiensi celeberrimo Quinti ut videtur post Christum Seculi eruit atque edidit* CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF. Lipsiæ: Tauchnitz. MDCCCXLIII.

2. *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus sive Fragmenta Veteris Testamenti: e Codice Græco Parisiensi celeberrimo Quinti ut videtur post Christum Seculi eruit atque edidit* CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF, *Theologiæ et Philosophiæ Doctor, &c. &c.* Lipsiæ: Tauchnitz, Jun. MDCCCXLV.

THE two quarto volumes, whose titles we have just given, have been for some years in the hands of the public; but we doubt whether, in this country at least, they have received the attention which their importance deserves. Even those who devote themselves more particularly to the study of the text of the Greek Testament, are content to rely on the *variæ lectiones* given in the critical editions of that book. This method is, indeed, quite sufficient for ordinary cases; nor, indeed, can the readings well be exhibited in a more convenient form, where one set has to be balanced against another. Yet it often happens that a particular reading requires to be seen with its context in order that its full meaning and bearing may be properly estimated; and in such cases it is of great consequence to have a faithful representation of the manuscript, giving neither more nor less than the original document. Such a representation (allowance being made for errors of observation and of the press) we have in the facsimile edition of the New Testament part of the Codex Alexandrinus, published by Woide, in 1786. This is, if we mistake not, the earliest specimen of printing the New Testament entire in facsimile type, and is a most valuable contribution, both to criticism and typography. It was followed in 1793 by a facsimile edition of the Codex Bezaë, at Cambridge, under the care of Kipling.¹ In 1801, Dr. Barrett published a facsimile edition of the Dublin Rescript of S. Matthew's Gospel, or rather of the fragments which remain. Between the years 1816 and 1828, came out H. H. Baber's facsimile edition of

¹ 'The type cast for Kipling's edition...is so wonderfully exact, that it possesses nearly all the advantages of an actual *facsimile*.' Scrivener, 'Introd. to Criticism of New Testament,' pp. 99—102 (1861). A new edition of the Codex Bezaë, by Mr. Scrivener, is advertised as being in the press. We gladly call the student's attention to the first of these volumes, and await with much curiosity the appearance of the second.

the LXX. version from the 'Codex Alexandrinus.' In all these editions, the types have been cut so as to resemble the letters of the MS.; and great as the expense must have been, we cannot grudge it in so good a cause, where art is made subservient to sacred criticism, and, in turn, receives illustration and improvement from it.¹ In a similar style, assisted, no doubt, by all the improvements which the science and skill of the present day can furnish, Professor Tischendorf proposes to bring out his edition of the 'Codex Sinaiticus,' under the auspices and at the expense of the Emperor of all the Russias, in this the one-thousandth year² from the first rise of that huge empire which has now spread itself into three quarters of our globe.

We have said that Woide's edition is the earliest facsimile edition of the New Testament which appeared in print. It should in fairness be mentioned that at Oxford, in 1715, came out Hearne's edition of the 'Codex Laudianus' of the Acts. In this edition the letters are uncials, but do not represent the shape of the letters in the original, they are mere ordinary capitals. The edition is printed so as to correspond, line by line, with the original, but (which is a defect) the columns and pages do not correspond therewith. The edition has also some errors, which may possibly be pointed out on some future occasion.

Professor Tischendorf, in his handsome edition of the Ephraem Rescript, has followed the precedent rather of Hearne than of Woide and the others whom we have mentioned. That is to say, his edition is printed in modern capitals without any special resemblance to the letters in the manuscript. But he has avoided the mistake (if we may venture to call it so), made by Hearne, inasmuch as in his edition, not only the lines in each page, but each page itself corresponds with the original. At the end of each volume, however, a valuable facsimile plate is given, in which may be traced, in ink of a pale blue colour, the dimly restored uncials of the first writing, with the over-written cursives in which the works of Ephraem appear in their deep black dress.³

There is another point of view in which we hail the appearance of these facsimile or representative editions of the earliest

¹ Mr. Scrivener is of a different opinion. 'These quasi facsimiles (for they are nothing more), while they add to the cost of the book, seem to answer no useful purpose.'—*Introd. to Criticism of New Testament*, p. 84 (1861).

² Stanley, 'Eastern Church,' l. ix. p. 350 (1861). 'The Norman race, which played so important a part in the civil and religious history of the West, as the allies or protectors of the Papal See, and as the founders of new dynasties in France, in Italy, in Sicily, and in England, had also established themselves on the throne of Russia, in the family of Ruric.' 'A.D. 862,' marg.

³ The parts given in the facsimile plates are 1 Tim. iii. 16—iv, 14, ριον της πιστewς—ο εδοθη ... Eccles. v. 5—17, και μη ειπης—αγαθωσυνην.

existing documents of the text of our Greek Testament. Supposing any of these documents to be destroyed, or lost, or by the mere lapse of time to become altogether evanescent,¹ their contents are now secure to us. Add to this, that the student can have them ready to his hand in his study, instead of taking a journey to Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, Paris, &c. or imposing an unwelcome labour on the kindness of some friend.

But we venture to hope that a yet brighter future awaits these venerable parchments, before they are lost or their characters have vanished. A recent publication has proved that the photo-zincographic process can be successfully applied to producing an exact likeness of an old manuscript, and to multiplying copies of that likeness to any extent.² The press and photography have made an alliance; the combined action of the two produces an effect perfectly astounding; a page of a manuscript is reproduced, letter by letter, and line by line; blot by blot and stain by stain, if any such there be. What the one faithfully paints, the other as faithfully stereotypes; we have come as near to the *κτῆμα ἐς αἰῶν*, as we can hope to do in matters of this sort, under the present conditions of existence.

One noble manuscript, the oldest perhaps of all that we have named, still remains in comparative obscurity, when we consider the amount of illustration which its younger and more fortunate brethren have received. No facsimile edition of the Codex Vaticanus has yet appeared. It would be a work worthy of that city which boasts of being the grand museum and prime centre of Christian art, to apply art's latest discovery to reproducing the earliest existing witness to the truth of the Christian records. Oh that her scholars (doubtless she has ripe and good ones) would lay aside their narrow prejudices and petty jealousies, and let the world see how *they* could illustrate their venerable document, than which their archives contain no greater treasure! If it has hitherto been a matter of reproach to them that they have not done what has been done at London, Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, Paris, they might now be able to say—We have waited till the most venerable document of Christian antiquity could be reproduced by a process worthy of itself; what has been our reproach shall be our reproach no longer. No metal type on which the workman's tool has been lifted, but the beams of an Italian sun shall print in its very actuality the CODEX VATICANUS.

¹ As may very likely become the case with the Ephraem Rescript itself.

² 'At a very trifling cost.' See *Introd. to Domesday Book*. 'Facsimile of the part relating to Cornwall, Photo-zincographed by Her Majesty's command. Col. Sir H. James. 1861.' See also 'Gloucester Fragments,' published by Mr. Eoxle. Longmans, 1861.

It may be asked, why should so much importance be attached to these manuscripts, when, after all, the Greek text of the New Testament is in everybody's hands? Our answer is this—To the student in Christian theology, the Greek text of the New Testament must ever be a subject of primary importance. If what S. Paul writes about the Old Testament holds also with regard to the New—*πάσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*; if apostles and evangelists wrote, as the prophets of old spake, *ὑπὸ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου φερόμενοι*; then must we think no labour too great, which will put us in possession of the *ipsissima verba* left on record by these *θεόπνευστοι*. Those divine words might have been written on tables of stone or brass, or on something more perennial than either. It pleased God that they should be committed to perishable materials. They were copied by persons who were liable to blunder, who did blunder. We have no apostolic autograph. We have not, at present, a copy of the New Testament older than the middle of the fourth century.¹ From that time we do indeed possess a sufficient number of copies. But as their readings do (within certain limits) vary, it is clear that we can only make an approximation (with more or less of probability) to what S. Matthew or S. Paul actually wrote down. And with this approximation we must, for the present, be satisfied.

Nor need we on this account be alarmed about the truth of the Gospel message. In astronomy and optics we are compelled to be contented with approximations to particular results, yet we are in no doubt about the substantial truths which those sciences set forth; and we are able by these approximations to make our calculations with perfect accuracy for all practical purposes.

So it is with the Greek text of the New Testament. The many thousands of various readings now collected, leave the main substance of its records the same as it was before. The real body of the Gospel truth remains as it was from the beginning.²

Still, it is from the manuscripts, versions, and patristic citations,

¹ The fragments of S. Matthew's gospel, and of the epistles of S. James and S. Jude, recently published in facsimile by M. Simonides from a papyrus roll, are no more than fragments. He maintains the documents to be of the first century. His arguments and the documents themselves will have to be tested by competent judges, before we admit the conclusion to which M. Simonides has led himself. See *Codex Mayerianus*, &c. &c. by Constantine Simonides, Ph.D. London, Trübner & Co. 1862.

² Stanley, 'Eastern Church,' l. viii. In the Koran, 'No various readings exist. Whatever it once had were destroyed by the Caliph Othman. Such is the strength of the Koran. In far other and opposite quarters lies the strength of the Bible... Its various readings are innumerable, and, in the New Testament, form one of the most instructive fields of theological study.' Pp. 320, 321 (1861).

that the text of the New Testament (as we have it) is formed. These are our witnesses. The more, therefore, we can sift, weigh, and balance the materials placed at our disposal; the more that we have them thoroughly at command, and know their real value; so much the more we strengthen our position against objectors, and help to secure the ground of our Christian faith.¹

Of these many witnesses we propose now to cite one of high antiquity, and most venerable appearance. In one important particular he is more remarkable than any of his existing predecessors or contemporaries. He has lately been resuscitated by a chemical process, and his testimony has been carefully noted down by Professor Tischendorf, who has given the result of his arduous labours in a printed uncial edition, which as good as places the original MS. in our hands, due allowance being, of course, made for the inevitable errors of the press. From his prolegomena the following details may be gathered:—

I. The Ephraem Rescript, generally designated in the critical editions of the New Testament by the letter C, is marked as No. 9 in the Imperial Library at Paris. The parchment is smooth and thin, much worn and perforated, and has been stained various colours by the chemical infusions which have been applied to it. The top and sides have been cut, so that the inscriptions are for the most part gone. Its size is nearly the same as that of the Alexandrine (A), and the Cottonian MS. (Evv. J.), much larger than that of the Cambridge (D). It was bound in 1602, and on the back are stamped the crown and arms of Henry IV. of France, with the letter H. Three recent parchment and two paper leaves have been prefixed.

In the MS. itself are 209 leaves. Each page has, with a few exceptions, about forty-one lines. A has, in each page, about fifty, B (Cod. Vat. 1209) forty-two, D thirty-three. In each full line are about forty letters; as many, that is, as are in the double column of A.

There are four distinct sets of handwriting. First, the original MS. of the LXX. and New Testament; then two sets of corrections; the whole of these, text and corrections, were erased to make room for the works of Ephraem Syrus, but have been restored by the application of the *Gibertina tinctura*. The original writing, thus restored, is uncial, continuous, and of an elegant character. Former facsimiles have not done justice to it, perhaps from the great difficulty of deciphering the

¹ We are enabled to state that there is now passing through the press at Oxford, a work in which some of the earliest MSS. of the New Testament will have their texts exhibited in parallel columns.

letters. In shape they agree with those in A, in the letters $\beta \gamma \eta \zeta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \rho \upsilon \chi \phi \psi \omega$; and differ slightly in the $\delta \sigma \epsilon \pi \tau \alpha \xi$. *E.g.* in the Alexandrine MS. the α has an angular form (Δ): in the Ephraem Rescript it is rounded (Δ): with this latter agree the forms of the α in the Vatican and Cambridge MSS. The size of the letters is not quite uniform: they are a little larger than those in A and B; smaller than in the Claromontanus (D epp.), much smaller than in the Cottonian, about equal to those in D. One mark seems to be peculiar to C. When ι and υ are to be pronounced distinct, they are over-lined, instead of being over-dotted; as $\bar{\upsilon}\rho\sigma$, $\bar{\iota}\sigma\chi\nu\sigma$, instead of $\upsilon\rho\sigma$, $\iota\sigma\chi\nu\sigma$. The difficulty of making out the MS. is very great, owing to the injuries it has sustained.

The lines written originally in red ink have quite disappeared. Of these there were generally three at the commencement of a new book: 1 Cor. had four lines in red at the beginning. There are the usual abbreviations of the sacred names, of $\alpha\nu\sigma$, &c.: and — is put over a letter for the final ν at the end of a line, as $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\bar{\omega}$. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ and $\tau\alpha\iota$ are not abbreviated in the usual form Τη Κη , nor is Υ put for $\sigma\upsilon$. Still traceable among the red ink lines themselves (now quite illegible) are the accents and marks supplied in black ink by the third hand.

The first hand used only a point in punctuation; it occupies about the space of one letter. ΓΡΑΦΑΙC·ΔΙΘΩN—CΓNEIΔHCEI·KAI—ΠACIN. The third hand added much punctuation, and the mark of the cross comes from the same hand, which, however, did nothing to the Apocalypse. The punctuation is by no means uniform. There is but little in the Acts, Catholic epistles, or Apocalypse. There is most in some of S. Paul's epistles.

The mark of apostrophe is seldom used by the first hand, and then only as a stop. It is never (as in A) placed after prepositions, whether written full or elided: $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho'$ $\alpha\pi'$. — is not used in a word which breaks off at the end of a line. $\aleph$ is the mark of quotation. Inscriptions are used only at the commencement of a fresh work,¹ and have mostly been cut off. The subscriptions are written at the distance of two, three, or five lines, according as the book ends at the bottom or in the middle of a page.

Of the 209 leaves mentioned above, 145 contain fragments of the New Testament. The remaining sixty-four contain fragments of the LXX. from Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song, Wisdom, Sirach.² These last are written stichometrically,

¹ Not, as in B, at the head of every page.

² The fragments which remain are, in the New Testament, Mat. i. 2—v. 15, $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ — $\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota \lambda\upsilon\ldots$ vii. 5—xvii. 26, $\delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu'$ — $\alpha\rho\alpha\ldots$ xviii. 28—xxii. (20, $\mu\omicron\iota$

and by a different hand from that which wrote the New Testament. But there seems no reason to doubt that they were written at the same time and place, and by scribes of the same school. The original leaves have been misplaced, and often inverted by the rescriptor: thus it cannot be *proved* that the Catholic epistles preceded the Pauline, though it is probable that they did. There is little doubt that the epistle to the Hebrews followed 2 Thessalonians, and preceded 1 Timothy.

II. *The country of the MS.* It has been mentioned before, that the MS. was found in 1602 in the reign of Henry IV.

20, μοι—επιγραφή... xxiii. 17—xxiv. 10, ἡνοας—ἀλλήλους... xxiv. 45—xxv. 30, εαυτου—εκβαλεται... xxvi. 22—xxvii. 11, εις εκαστος—ιουδαιων... xxvii. 47—xxviii. 14, τινες—ποίησμεν.

Mc. i. 17—vi. 31, υμας—ἡκαυρου... viii. 5—xii. 29, πορευτα—ει(ς) εστιν... xiii. 19, *** γαραι—finem.

Lc. i. 2—ii. 5, και υπηρεται—μεμνηστευμενη ****... ii. 42—iii. 21, λυμα κατα—λαον... iv. 25—vi. 4, επι—εδωκεν... vi. 37—vii. 16, και μη—λαον αυτου... viii. 28—xii. 3, νη μεγαλη—δωματων... xix. 42—xx. 27, σου οτι—αυτον... xxi. 21—xxii. 19, τοτε οι—εις την... xxiii. 25—xxiv. 7, εις την—αυον... xxiv. 46, και ειπεν—finem.

Jo. i. 3—41, δε εν ο—ιωαννου... iii. 33—v. 16, την μαρτυριαν—εν σαββατω... vi. 38—vii. 3, ω το θελημα—ινα και... viii. 34—ix. 11, πας ο—και ειπεν... xi. 8—46, γουσιν αυτω—εποιησεν ις... xiii. 8—xiv. 7, λεγει αυτω—εωρακατε... xvi. 21—xviii. 36, οτι εγενηθη—κοσμου του... xx. 26, και μεθ—finem.

Act. i. 2—iv. 3, πνευματος—εις την... v. 35—x. 42, ειπεν δε—και νεκρων... xiii. 1—xvi. 36, ος μαναην—εν ειρηνη... xx. 10—xxi. 30, λων αυτου—αι θυραι... xxii. 21—xxiii. 18, και ειπεν—προς τον χιλιαρ... xxiv. 15—xxv. 19, πιδα εχων—απειθης τη... xxvii. 16—xxviii. 4, φης ην αραντες—ουκ εισαεν.

Jac. i. 1—iv. 2, * ακ*—πολεμειτε.

1 Pe. i. 2—iv. 5, πνευματος—νεκρους... 2 Pe. i. 2, χαρις—finem.

1 Jo. i. 1—iv. 20, ο ην—του θεου... 3 Jo. 3, εχαρην—finem.

Jud. 3, αγαπητοι—finem.

Ro. i. 3—ii. 5, του γενομενου—αγει κα... iii. 21—xi. 31, και των—γυν ηπει... xiii. 10, ουν νομου—finem.

1 Cor. i. 3—vii. 18, χαρις—επισπασθω... ix. 6—xiii. 8, γαζεσθαι—γλωσσαι... xv. 40, μεν η των—finem.

2 Cor. i. 2—x. 8, και ειρηνη—καθ αιρεσιν υμων.

Gal. i. 21, επειτα—finem ... Eph. ii. 18—iv. 16, οι αμφοτεροι—εν αγαπη ... Phil. i. 22—iii. 5, ρησομαι—φυλης βενια ... Col. i. 2, χαρις—finem. 1 Th. i. 2—ii. 8, ευχαριστουμεν—εγενηθητε ... Heb. ii. 4—vii. 26, μερισμοις—ακακος ... ix. 25—x. 24, εστιν—παρουσμον αγα ... xii. 16, μητις—finem.

1 Tim. iii. 9—v. 19, ριον της—μαρτυρων ... 2 Tim. i. 3, χαριν—finem. Tit. i. 2, προ χρονων—finem. Philem. iii. χαρις—finem.

Apoc. i. 3—iii. 19, ος εμαρτυρησεν—και μετα ... v. 14—vii. 14, κυνησαν—οντοι εισιν ... ix. 17—xvi. 13, και οντως—τρια ακαθαρ ... xviii. 2—xix. 5, παντος ορνεου—οι μικροι ...

It will be borne in mind that in this list words, and even lines have sometimes disappeared. Also Rev. vii. 17—viii. 4, comes between x. 10 and xi. 3. The fragments of the Old Testament are Job ii. 12—iv. 12, ... v. 27—vii. 7, ... x. 9—xii. 2, ... xiii. 18—xviii. 9, ... xix. 27—xxii. 14, ... xxiv. 7—xxx. 1, ... xxxi. 6 ... xxxv. 16, xxxvii. 5—xxxviii. 17, ... xl. 20—finem.

Prov. i. 1—ii. 8, ... xv. 29—xvii. 1, ... xviii. 11—xix. 26, ... xxii. 17—xxiii. 25, ... xxix. 27—xxx. 21, ... xxvi. 24—xxviii. 2, ... xxix. 30, 31.

Ecol. i. 1—14, ii. 18—finem.

Cant. i. 1—iii. 9.

Sap. Sol. viii. 5—xii. 10, ... xiv. 19—xvii. 18, ... xviii. 24—xix. 22.

Sap. Sir. Prol. vii. 14, ... viii. 15—xi. 17, ... xii. 16, ... xvi. 1, ... xvii. 12—xx. 5, ... xxi. 12—xxii. 19, ... xxvii. 19—xxviii. 25, ... xxx. 8—xxx. 1, ... xxxii. 18—xxxiii. 22, ... xxxvii. 11—xxxviii. 15, ... xxxix. 7—xliv. 27, ... xlv. 24—xlx. 12.

It had before this time come into the possession of Catharine de Medici from the library of Marshal Peter Strozzi. The marshal, who was acquainted with Greek, and fond of books, had bought the MS. from the collection of Cardinal Nicolas Ridolphi, of Florence, who was a nephew of Pope Leo, and died 1550. It seems not at all unlikely that the Cardinal had it from Andrew John Lascaris, surnamed Rhynchacemus, who was sent, at the fall of the Greek empire, by Lorenzo de Medici to the East to rescue MSS. from the hands of the Turks. He died at Rome, 1535, aged ninety. The catalogue of the Cardinal is still extant, and the MS. is mentioned in it.

The MS., before it came to Italy, had probably been at Constantinople. There can be little doubt that the rescript was made there; and previously to the rescription, the notes and corrections put into the original MS. by the third hand indicate a Constantinopolitan origin. For in the handwriting of the second corrector (that is, the third hand) the saints Cosmas and Damianus, known as *οι αγιοι αναργυροι*, are commemorated, as are also *οι αγιοι νοταριοι*, who were killed in the disturbances raised about Macedonius. Now these festivals belong to the calendar of Constantinople, and to that alone. Again, the corrections made by the third hand show the Greek of a later and more corrupt age, *e.g.* *της μαθιτες* for *τοις μαθηταις*—*εμβιβε ης τω πλυον* for *εμβηβαι εις το πλοιον*—*ευδωματος* for *εβδωματος*—*νησθιον* for *νηστειων*. Again, the corrections made by the third hand in the text agree with the readings of those MSS. which are considered to be of Constantinopolitan origin. But where was the original MS. written? The text of the first hand differs considerably from that of the third; so, too, does the formation of the nouns and verbs: the country of the original MS. was clearly not Constantinople. Its readings and formations agree with those of the Alexandrine fathers (*e.g.* Clement and Origen), and of the MSS. supposed to be of Egyptian origin. Moreover, the handwriting agrees with that of A and B, MSS. of which there is little doubt that they belong to the Alexandrine school. Now we must not press Alexandrine formations of nouns and verbs too far to prove the country of a MS., as those formations were probably used by the apostles themselves; and any copyist would naturally be anxious to preserve what was originally written. Still there are fair grounds for thinking that Egypt, if not Alexandria itself, was the native country of our MS.

There are readings which indicate that the scribe was not an accurate Greek scholar. We have, Luke viii. 41, *εις το οικον*; Acts x. 19, *τον πνα*; Eph. iv. 14, *προς τη μεθοδειαν*; Heb. iv. 12,

ζω for ζων, &c. Again: the punctuation is often most absurd: e.g. Luke xi. 39, αρπαγης· και πονηριας—Luke xi. 47, 48, απεκτειναν· αυτους· αρα—John iv. 27, ελαλει ουδεις—1 Cor. iii. 17, φθει· ρει—2 Pet. iii. 4, κτισε· ως.¹

On the other hand, the writing is good. Alexandria was famed for its copyists.² Thus the indifferent grammar and bad punctuation, combined with the good handwriting, point to an Egyptian scribe acquainted with Greek, but not master of it, yet well practised in calligraphy.

The MS. probably left Egypt before the first set of corrections was made. These corrections come between the Alexandrine and Constantinopolitan forms, inclining to the former. They might have been made in Palestine, Syria, or Asia Minor.

III. *The date of the MS.*—There are fair grounds for thinking that C is older than A; at all events, not later than the fifth century, the probable date of the latter.³

It was mentioned before that the letters in C resemble in form those in A. But the *a* in C is more like the *a* in the Vatican MS., which is now generally considered to be the oldest extant MS. of the New Testament.⁴

The punctuation in C is extremely simple. The mark - to unite the parts of a divided word, is not used; nor the mark , except occasionally as a stop.⁵ Only the most ancient abbreviations are used. The abbreviations ΚϚ and Τη do not occur; and, in this respect, C agrees with B. Neither in C or A is there any division of chapters from the Acts to the Apocalypse, though these were in use from the time of Euthalius (fifth century).⁶ In the Gospels the Ammonian sections (third century) are used, not the Eusebian canons (fourth century). The greater sections (κεφάλαια or τίτλοι), though given in a table before each Gospel, are not marked in the text. This seems to indicate that though made, these sections were not at the time fully authorised. The Epistle to the Hebrews comes between 2 Thes-

¹ Other instances are cited by Prof. Tischendorf. Proleg. p. 18.

² 'De eo character loquuntur patres Synodi Constantinop. dictæ, ubi de Photio patriarcha agunt: Σύγγραμμα καταρτισάμενος ἐπὶ παλαιότητων χαρίτων γράμμασιν Ἀλεξανδρινοῖς τὴν ἀρχαίαν μάλιστα χειροθεσίαν μνησάμενος γράφει.' Wetstenius, Proleg. Nov. Test. p. 11.

³ Woide assigns an earlier date to the Alexandrine MS., 'intra medium et finem seculi quarti.' Præf. § 80, p. xviii.

⁴ We still lack full information about the Codex Sinaiticus. The result of private enquiries made at Cairo is, that the MS. was not shown to Prof. Tischendorf on his two first visits to Mt. Sinai, as it was considered to be a relic. On his third visit he came as the accredited agent of the Emperor of Russia.

⁵ In A it is often placed at the end of a word, especially of prepositions: e.g. ανηρ· ἐξ· υπ'αρχειν.

⁶ In the Acts, Catholic and Pauline epistles, B has a double set of sections peculiar to itself.

salonians and 1 Timothy, as in A, B,¹ and also in $\aleph$ (Codex Sinaiticus), but (as we believe) in no other known MS. The inscriptions and subscriptions are extremely simple; in no MS. are they more so. Peculiar to C is the subscription to 2 Peter, *Πετρον καθολικη*. The inscription is *Πετρον επιστολη β̄*.

The corrections by the second hand are probably of the sixth or seventh century. Those by the third hand seem to belong to the ninth century, as far as can be inferred from the shape of the letters.

The text itself is ancient, very like that which Origen used; but this, of course, does not *prove* anything about the age of the MS.

The interchange of vowels began from the earliest centuries after the Christian era. In C are perpetually interchanged—

ει and *ι*, e.g. *αναδιξον*. *αι* and *ε*, e.g. *ετερες*.

Also frequently, *η* and *ε*, e.g. *ηδε δε η αξινη*; Mt. iii. 10. *ει* or *ι* and *η*, e.g. *πρωτοκλησιας*; Lk. xi. 43. *εν τω σκηνη*; 2 Cor. v. 4. *η ιρης*; Ap. x. 1.

Sometimes are confused—

οι and *υ*, e.g. *σοι κυριε* for *συ*; Ac. i. 24. *ο ανυγων*; Ap. iii. 7. *σοι οιδας*; Ap. vii. 14. *λεων μοικαται*; x. 3.

Twice *η* is written for *οι*. *εν της συγγενεσιν*; Mat. vi. 4. *η μαστοι*; Lk. xi. 27.

We find *ι* for *υ* in *δυκτυα*; Lk. v. 2. And *Βυθυνια* occurs Ac. xvi. 7.

IV. The text of the *prima manus* in C agrees mainly with the readings exhibited by Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Athanasius, and the Coptic version. Yet it differs in passages where the Alexandrine school is generally acknowledged to be in error. Thus C reads in Mt. xxvi. 71, *εξελθοντα δε αυτον*, where B L Z and seven cursives omit the *αυτον*, D reading *εξελθοντος δε αυτου*. And it agrees with the text commonly received, where the latter differs from the readings of the Alexandrine school, but has ancient testimonies in its favour. Thus, in Gal. iii. 1, C reads with the Æthiopic versions, *εβασκανεν τη αληθεια μη πειθεσθαι*. It also has many readings, which are supported by few but these very ancient witnesses; as in Heb. ii. 6, *τις εστιν* with the Coptic and three MSS. of the Italic version.

Instances of forms which occur in Alexandrine MSS. are, *λημφεται—συνλυπουμενος—τεσσερα—παρεδιδετο—ρεραντισμενοι—εκαθερισθη—αφηκες—ηρωτουν—νικουντι—ειπαν—αντιοχεαν—πιν—αναπαησονται* (Ap. xiv. 13)—*εορακαν—εραυνα—κραβαττον—αναβαινον—αλεις, &c.*

¹ This is and always was the case with B, but the marginal sections show that B was copied from a MS. which placed the Hebrews between Galatians and Ephesians.

Mistakes in writing occur, as *φητου* for *προφητου*, *σωσωων* for *σωσων*, *εσχατως* *εσχατως* *εχει*, &c.

V. *The correctors.*—Of corrections made by the original writer there are very few indeed.

The first corrector, *i.e.* the second hand, wrote with elegance. He did not employ accents or breathings; the form of his letters agrees with that of the first hand; yet there *is* a difference, which is made yet more apparent by marks of erasure, and ink of a different hue. He never drew lines across the original writing. He has the same vowel interchanges as the first hand, and keeps to the Alexandrine forms. Though he has many readings from the school of Constantinople, yet he retains the readings which more specially mark the Alexandrine school, and has even added some which were not in the original MS.¹

His country might have been Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, or even Egypt itself. His text, as to its general character, stands about midway between the Alexandrine and Byzantine texts. His date may be a century later than that of the first hand, but this is only a conjecture.

The second corrector, that is, the third hand, cared more for use than ornament. He draws a line through words, writes above them or in the margin; mixes cognate letters (consonants as well as vowels),² as was the custom of his age. His hand is quick and practised. He uses abbreviations, accents, and the rough breathing; but more in the text than in his own notes. He added much punctuation, and has very often the mark of the cross. Many of his corrections are made for the purposes of recitation, and marks are put in to distinguish parts in the text, and to guide reciters.³ Similar marks are found in other MSS. used for Church purposes.

His text agrees with that of the Byzantine MSS., yet he left untouched many readings which differ from them, and has even brought forward readings of his own which vary altogether from the common text.⁴ There is but little doubt that his country was Constantinople; his age, the ninth century. Certain festivals have been marked by a hand, which comes apparently between the second and third. Also, there are two notes in

¹ Thus in Jo. ix. 6, C² reads *αυτου τον πληον*. In Rom. iv. 11, C² erases *την* before *δικαιοσυνην*. In Mk. xi. 13, C² adds *μονον* after *φυλλα*. In Col. ii. 4, C² reads *παρалоγισηται*. In Mk. xii. 1, *αυτω φραγμα*.

² *E.g.* ω and ο, ε and αι, θ and τ, β and υ, as *ευδωμαδος* for *εβδομαδος*, &c. Letters are transposed, as *ευγαγγελιον*.

³ Examples are given in the facsimile page at the end of Prof. Tischendorf's edition.

⁴ Thus in Lk. v. 21, C² reads *εις ο θεος*. In Mt. x. 8, he marks out *νεκρους* *εγειρετε*. In Heb. xiii. 21, he marks out *των αιωνων*.

cursives on the first page of the Acts, which belong to some other than the third hand.¹

VI. *The overwritten works of Ephraem Syrus.* In the twelfth or thirteenth century, the original text and subsequent corrections were all erased, in order to make room for a Greek translation of the works of Ephraem Syrus. This new writing is in cursive characters, large and elegant, with accents and breathings. An edition from this superwritten MS. was published at Oxford, 1709. It consists of discourses on moral and religious subjects.

VII. *Collations made of C.* The original writing² was first discovered by Peter Allixius, a man of learning, who received the degree of Honorary Doctor, both from Oxford and Cambridge. He was born at Alençon, 1641, and died at London, 1717.

John Boivinus, royal librarian at Paris, was the first who examined the original writing, and hence it has been thought that he first discovered it. His remarks are now prefixed to the Codex, and were published by Blanchinius in his 'Evangeliarium,' p. CDXCIX.; and again (with a few changes) in the catalogue of the MSS. in the Royal (Imperial) Library, tom. ii. no. 9. The notes at the top of the page, showing to what part each fragment belongs, are by Boivinus; as also some marginal notes, giving the original MS. in common characters. Boivinus sent the readings which he had made out to Kuster, who made use of them in bringing out the new edition of Mill's Greek Testament, in 1710. Bernard Lamy, author of a 'Commentary on the Harmony of the Gospels' (Paris, 1699), said of C, 'forsan non alius est codex vetustior.' It was also inspected by Melotus, who is said to have been principally concerned in drawing up the catalogue of the MSS. in the Royal Library; and by Montfalcon.

The catalogue left the press in 1740. But Wetstein had come, quite as a young man, to Paris before 1716; had made his collations of the MS. and placed them at the disposal of

¹ I.e. the fragments of the LXX. and of the new Testament, under the works of Ephraem Syrus.

² Mr. Scrivener's account of the correctors seems hardly correct. 'Three correctors at least have been at work on Cod. C; they are respectively indicated by Tischendorf as C*, C**, C***. The earliest may have been of the sixth century, the second perhaps of the ninth, who revised such portions only as were adapted to ecclesiastical use, &c.'—Introd. to Criticism of New Testament, p. 96 (1861). Tischendorf, in his edition of the New Testament, denotes by C* the *prima manus*, by C** the *secunda manus* or first corrector (6th century), by C*** the *tertia manus* or second corrector (9th century): in the appendix to his edition of the Ephraem Rescript, he generally denotes C* by A, C** by B, C*** by C. Yet in the appendix, p. 310, we find corrector A twice used as = C**, and corrector B as = C*** (Mt. viii. 3—5). The same page identifies C*, C**, C***, with the *prima*, *secunda*, *tertia manus* respectively (Mt. iii. 6).

Bentley, who was so far struck by them, that he induced Wetstein to make a second collation. This second collation was inserted in an edition of the New Testament published at Rotterdam, 1654, and is now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A note in Wetstein's handwriting records the fact of the collation; and Bentley has added that the collation cost him 50*l*. He, however, never went on with his proposed edition of the New Testament, and so made no use of his purchase. Wetstein's was, on the whole, a good collation. He is said to have shown an indomitable patience in what was certainly a most laborious task. The result of his labours he published in his edition of the New Testament, 1751-2. The points where Wetstein is deficient are as follows:—1. He did not note the places where nothing could be made out, or the places where the MS. agrees with the Elzevir edition. 2. Many places where the MS. differs from the ordinary text escaped him altogether. In S. Mark alone he has left unnoticed more than a hundred such. 3. He did not properly distinguish between the different hands. 4. He sometimes mistook the reading. Of these false readings Tischendorf makes out as many as 115. In two or three instances Wetstein was able to see more than Tischendorf. With more or less of care, the MS. has been inspected by Less, Griesbach, who in 1780 compared Wetstein's collation, Woide, and Scholz.

But a new era, indeed a new life, was in store for the buried treasure. In 1834, Professor Fleck, of Leipzig, induced Hase, the librarian of the Royal Library at Paris, to have the *Giober-tina tinctura* applied, with a view of renovating the faded characters. This delicate operation was taken in hand by Simoninus, a person of great repute in Paris for such matters, and he succeeded in renovating a hundred leaves between Jan. 28 and Feb. 15. The rest were similarly restored in the following year (1835), between April 10 and May 19. Fleck, however, was less felicitous in his examination than Simoninus was in the restoration of the MS.

VIII. The labours of Professor Tischendorf have as good as placed the restored MS. in the hands of the public. From December, 1840, till September, 1842, he devoted himself at Paris to the careful scrutiny of the Ephraem Rescript. The result of his arduous toil he published at Leipzig, in 1843. This volume, which contains the fragments of the New Testament, is a quarto, in uncial characters, each page corresponding with the arranged pages of the original, both as to lines and letters. The old punctuation is noted. The leaves that are wanting in the original are also wanting in the printed edition. Where the writing of the first hand is not legible, the text of

the second hand is given in smaller, but still uncial characters; in the appendix is noted what might have been, with more or less probability, the reading of the first hand. The readings of the third hand are nowhere given in the text, but are noted in the appendix. On the margin of the text are the Ammonian Sections. Prefixed to S. Luke and S. John are the headings of certain sections of those gospels. Where letters are not legible, but the number of missing letters is evident, the learned editor has indicated the lacuna by a corresponding number of marks „ „ „. Where the number of letters cannot be fairly ascertained, he has indicated the lacuna by — — —.

The foregoing details, abridged from the Prolegomena of Professor Tischendorf, may, perhaps, have appeared over minute. Yet, on the other hand, we must not forget how much depends on our making an accurate estimate of them. By their means it is that we are enabled to make a close approximation to the actuality of what the apostles and evangelists wrote. More than this we cannot do, even with the ample materials now at our command. Yet while we reflect, with all thankfulness, that we have substantially the *ipsissima verba* of the sacred writers, so we may bear in mind that, the further our researches are carried, the more grounds we have for making a closer approximation. And he who believes Holy Scripture to contain all things necessary for our salvation, will think no pains ill-bestowed which tend to show on surer grounds what *is* Holy Scripture.

Let us pause, for one moment, to remark upon the peculiar kind of evidence which this MS., so long buried, so lately resuscitated, affords to the reality of our existing Greek Testament text. Here is a MS. written, unless we are prepared to set aside the judgment of all who are conversant in MSS., before the middle of the fifth century. It is corrected by a second hand in the sixth or seventh century, and again by a third hand, for ecclesiastical purposes, in the ninth century. In the twelfth or thirteenth century, the original writing and the corrections are all rubbed out as much as possible, and the materials are employed for a work altogether different. Fortunately, the original writing had sunk too deep into the parchment to be altogether removed, even by erasure and ablation. In the seventeenth century it is detected faintly glimmering through the blacker character of the later writing. In the eighteenth century, a good scholar, with a young and strong pair of eyes, succeeds in disinterring, to a great extent, the hidden treasure. Still it is felt that something is yet wanting. In the nineteenth century, a chemical process brings to light the latent characters of the original writing; and in spite of the wear and tear which the venerable parchments have undergone,

in spite of the discolouring caused by the very means employed in its restoration, it is fairly legible even to unpractised eyes.¹

As a sample of the kind of evidence afforded by the Ephraem Rescript to the text of the New Testament, we may take the celebrated passage, 1 Tim. iii. 16. Wetstein thought that the prima manus wrote OC. The transverse line which makes O into Θ was not visible to him. It is true there is a transverse line above the letters in question, such as would be placed over $\overline{\Theta C}$, and would not be placed over OC. But then he observed that this upper line was of a clumsier character than the writing of the prima manus; so concluded that it was put in by a later hand.

Woide owned that the transverse line necessary to form Θ was absent, but denied the alleged clumsiness of the over-written line. He concluded that the line across the O had faded, and that C' had written $\overline{\Theta C}$. With him agreed Weber and Pacquoi.

Griesbach sided with Wetstein, and argued at some length in favour of OC. It is unnecessary to go into his arguments, because, although he came to a right conclusion, he did so from wrong premises. Up to the time when the original writing was restored, all had agreed that there was no transverse line across the O.

But the revival of the evanescent characters has enabled Professor Tischendorf to pronounce with confidence, that there are plain marks of the Theta line to be made out under the middle *a* of the overwritten word *αμαρτημα* in the works of Ephraem Syrus. There are then the upper line over the two letters, the Theta line, and underneath, as Pacquoi had pointed out, two musical notes marking clearly a dissyllable. $\overline{\Theta C}$.

But the question is, who put in these different marks? Now the line across the O agrees in colour with the writing of the third hand, and also in direction; for it ascends slightly from left to right; it is not perfectly horizontal. So too does the upper line, and this is one of the characteristics of the third hand. It is also a thicker line than those of the first hand, and at the right extremity has a sharp turn downwards —, such as the third hand constantly employs, the first hand never.

The two musical notes undoubtedly came from the third hand, but, on the whole, there is but little doubt that the first hand wrote OC, and that the third hand altered it to $\overline{\Theta C}$.

It may be said that the first hand wrote $\overline{\Theta C}$, that the lines

¹ As we saw at Paris in 1855.

faded and were afterwards restored. It is singular, however, that this should have been the only instance of such restoration. There are many instances where the lines made by the first hand have faded, and have not been restored; none, except this alleged case, where they have.

We do not propose, on the present occasion, to give further specimens of the peculiar readings which are to be found in the fragments of the New Testament contained in this manuscript. To do this with anything like completeness would very far transgress the limits of a single article. Moreover, the labour would seem to be superfluous, inasmuch as the readings in the Ephraem Rescript are, and have long been, accessible to the public in a variety of ways. We have before alluded to the length of time, during which the two volumes named at the head of this article have been published; in these two volumes we have the entire text; but the readings may be found in the editions of the New Testament put forth by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and (to the end of the Gospels) by Tregelles.¹

We therefore proceed to notice very briefly the contents of the volume which contains the fragments of the Old Testament. The materials which the restored manuscript furnishes towards the text of the LXX. version are very valuable, but (alas!) very scanty.

The portion in which the fragments of the Old Testament are contained, was written by a different hand from that employed in writing the New Testament, but is probably of the same date. It perhaps never contained more than the five poetical books, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song, together with the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach. These are all written stichometrically, as they are in the Alexandrine MS. But even of these we have but fragments remaining. They are enumerated by Professor Tischendorf in the Prolegomena to his edition of the Rescript, and of the LXX. The Psalms are entirely lost. Nineteen leaves contain all that now remains from the Book of Job. The fragments of the Proverbs occupy six leaves; those of Ecclesiastes eight leaves. One leaf is all that remains of the Song. The Wisdom of Solomon is in seven leaves. Siracides has fared better, the remains occupying twenty-three leaves.

A few of the inscriptions and subscriptions have escaped the ravages of time, and of the *rescribens*. Chiefly noticeable are the subscription to the Book of Proverbs, *παροιμια σολομωντος*

¹ We earnestly hope that Dr. Tregelles may be enabled to finish his valuable and beautifully executed edition of the New Testament; and that the Government will lend a favourable ear to the petition, which has, as we understand, been addressed in his behalf.

παρα εβδομηκοντα; the inscription to the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus, προλογος σιραχ; and the inscription to the Book of Ecclesiasticus, σοφια ιησου υιου σιραχ.

The fragments of the Old Testament contain the following forms of words, which more or less illustrate the same, or similar forms, found in the older MSS. of the New Testament.

Consonants are sometimes doubled, as φθαννει—διαβεννεις (διαβαινεις)—βαλλαντιον—αποκτεννι (αποκτενει). Vowels are changed, as τεσσερα—αροτριουντας—καλαμουμενος—χρειοφιλετου (χρεωφειλετου)—ολεθρεων. The augment is sometimes neglected, as μεταβαλλετο—ενκεντριζοντο—προσκαλεσαμην—ευοδωσεν—διορθωθησαν—εορακα. The augment is sometimes doubled or transposed, ηγαυριωντο—επαρεκαλουν—επροφητευσεν—διηνεωκτο—διηυλαβουντο—ηυλογησεν—ηυφρανθη. The letter ν is sometimes added to the accusative singular in such words as ασεβην (Sirac. xlii. 2), χειραν (Wisdom. xi. 20). Instances of this usage are found in the Alexandrine MS., e.g. τιναν (Luke xxi. 2), ποδηρην (Rev. i. 13), received into the text by Tischendorf, and by Lachmann in his smaller edition. Aspirates are sometimes neglected, as ουκ ο φοβος—ουκ ευρεθησαν, &c. In αφηλπισεν we have a converse instance, but this, perhaps, arises from the practice of the later Greek, in adding an aspirate to ελπισ, as ελπις. Instances occur of conjunctions followed by unusual moods, as ινα επαποστρεφονται—ινα δεσποξει—εως συντριψη και ανταποδιδωσι—μηποτε ποιηση και καταισχυναι—ινα ευοδωσει—εαν ενπιστευσει—μη καταδεσμευσεις—ινα κοπιασει.

The general character of the LXX. text in the Ephraem Rescript seems to hold a middle place between that of the Alexandrine and that of the Vatican MSS. It very often agrees with the Alexandrine against the Vatican, especially in Job, Proverbs, the Song, Ecclesiastes; less frequently in Siracides; much less so in Wisdom. But on the other hand, there are many instances where the text of the Rescript supports the Vatican against the Alexandrine; and there are other instances where it differs from them both. The peculiar readings are found mostly in the apocryphal books.

Before we conclude our remarks, it may be as well to warn those who may have occasion to consult either of the two volumes to which we have ventured to call the reader's attention, that they must be on their guard against certain misprints, which have been pointed out by Professor Tischendorf himself. Corrections of misprints in the text of the New Testament will be found in the Prolegomena to the Fragments of the LXX. (§ 12, pp. 10, 11), and in the Prolegomena to the Professor's edition of the New Testament, p. clxxviii. note.

Corrections of misprints in the Fragments of the LXX. will be found in the Prolegomena to the Professor's edition of the LXX. (p. lxxxiv. note 1).

We may be permitted to remark, in conclusion, that documents such as these have a philological as well as a theological value. They exhibit the Greek language under one of its most peculiar phases—when influences of various kinds, and coming from various quarters, were acting upon it. Macedonian forces, combined with Oriental forms of thought and modes of speech, are here seen in operation, as they were at Alexandria fourteen hundred years ago. We mark the curious changes in spelling, and the intrusion of forms, some of which are (strictly speaking) ungrammatical. The living truths of Christianity did not require the high polish of Attic diction for their safe transmission, though Athens has had her full share in preparing the language in which they were to be perpetuated.

ART. III.—*The Life of Edward Irving.* By MRS. OLIPHANT.
Two Vols. London. 1862.

THE public owes a debt of gratitude to any one who calls its attention to the life and acts of a man whose half-forgotten, perhaps more than half-misunderstood, character had considerable influence upon the religious thought of his time, and still exercises sway over a portion of society. Under such an obligation has Mrs. Oliphant laid the public by her '*Life of Edward Irving.*' We may be surprised, but we cannot regret, that the task of writing Irving's biography had not been undertaken long ago; had not been performed as a 'labour of love' by some one of the many ardent followers who gathered round this remarkable leader.¹ We say we cannot regret it, because while another pen could hardly have done the work with greater success, with more grace, with fuller justice, certainly an earlier time would have been too early for giving forth Edward Irving's life with the best advantage to the world. It is true that, in a general way, the lives of men ought to be written as soon as they have ceased to live, and while the personal recollections of friends are still fresh and accurate. It is true that lapse of time dims the memory, confuses facts, effaces impressions. Boswell is the prince of biographers, and, for ordinary cases, the more like Boswell a biographer is, the better fitted is he for his work. But Irving's is not an ordinary life. The minute incident, the fragments of conversation, the telling anecdote, which give to a common biography its chief value, are but of subordinate importance in the life of Irving; they tell us nothing of what we most want to know—of how his wonderful mind struggled against the trammels of a narrow theology, now breaking loose into ways, which some called heresy, now rising to doctrinal heights, and bringing upon himself the odium of popish, at least of prelatial, leanings. Visionary, enthusiast, fanatic, im-

¹ We, of course, are aware that many sketches of Irving, of more or less merit, exist. Besides the articles in biographical dictionaries and encyclopædias (which, so far as we are acquainted with them, repeat with a dull monotony the same distorted opinions of the man, proceeding, as they mostly do, from the pens of Presbyterian ministers—the very worst possible judges in the matter), there are distinct attempts at a *Life*—among which that by Mr. Washington Wilks, though pretending to little, accomplishes much—may be mentioned. But there is not one which can in any way be considered as pre-occupying the ground which Mrs. Oliphant has so admirably appropriated.

postor, such were the names with which he was abundantly stigmatized by his contemporaries; and it may be laid down as a canon of literature, that the biography of a man, whose conduct and opinions brought such censures upon him during his lifetime, ought not to be written till the generation which bestowed them has passed away. For this reason do we assert that if Irving's life had been written sooner, it would have been written too soon. Whatever truth there may be in the poet's proverb—

‘Men’s evil manners live in brass; their virtues
We write in water;’

it does not apply to theological misdemeanours or doctrinal offences. Time quickly floats into oblivion the vagaries of opinion to which extraordinary minds may have given way, or which a vulgar outcry may have goaded them to utter. But the discoveries in the region of truth, which they may have made, are cherished and acknowledged by a grateful posterity. Not that we wish to prejudge the questions which will have to be discussed in the present paper. Our sole purpose in making them has been to insure to our own and to the reader's minds a healthy state in which to approach our subject. We feel, and we wish the reader to feel, that some precaution is needful in order to free oneself of the bias, either on one side or the other, which the attitude of Irving towards Catholic truth, or the attitude of the Kirk towards Irving, so strongly tends to incumber the mind.

Edward Irving was born at Annan, in Dumfriesshire, on the 4th August, 1792. His parents belonged to that class in society from which the Kirk for the most part draws her ministers. His father, Gavin Irving, was a tanner by trade; by descent (maternally) of an Albigensian stock. His mother, Mary Lowther, was a woman handsome in person, high in spirit, both which qualities her son Edward, as also his brothers, inherited in full measure. His education began at what we should call a dame's school, kept by one Peggy Paine, a kinswoman of the notorious Tom Paine. Thence he passed on to the Annan Academy, a school which under this pretentious title did that good service to the natives which Scotch country middle class schools do in a more marked way than the corresponding schools in England. It is noticeable how far oftener in after life, and how much more warmly, Scotchmen speak of their old school and their old schoolmasters and mates than do Englishmen. These country schools in Scotland give, or at least used to give, sound learning to the lads of the country side, sending the most part of them to farm, or to be ‘merchants’ (as tradesmen are grandly called in the phrase of the North), well grounded in the be-

ginnings of Latin, and Greek, and mathematics. This general spread of the roots of what might be cultivated into higher learning gives the Scotch yeoman and tradesman an intellectual superiority much to be admired, notwithstanding the occasional pedantry which it is apt to breed. From these schools, too, a boy of superior promise is drafted off through the university to one of the learned professions. A youth of parts is singled out to delight his father with the hope—than which nothing can be more flattering to the pride of the Scotch yeoman—of seeing his son ‘wag his pow in a pu’pit o’ his ain.’ Whether Gavin was fired by this ambition we know not. But the academy at Annan had no mean boast that it sent forth the Irvings, and after them Thomas Carlyle. Not that Edward Irving gave much promise at school. There is no record of his distinguishing himself among his fellows. And no wonder. Genius seldom stands at the top of the class; talent often; industry oftener still.

At thirteen Irving went to Edinburgh to pass over the curriculum of a Scotch university. From a lad he grew into a youth without having called forth any special remark, so far as record goes. At the age of seventeen he completed his course—a creditable, uneventful course—by taking his A.M. degree. Of his doings and habits during this period, one incident only is noteworthy. He made acquaintance with, and made himself owner of, Hooker’s ‘Ecclesiastical Polity.’ This, in itself, trifling fact, is important as giving an early intimation of a tendency of his mind, the fuller development of which in later years we shall have to remark upon. In after life he used to speak of ‘the venerable companion of my early days, Richard Hooker.’ One more forecast of future things we may take from this college time:—

“‘He used to carry continually in his waistcoat pocket,’” says one of his few surviving college companions, the Rev. Dr. Grierson, of Errol, “a miniature copy of Ossian; passages from which he read or recited in his walks in the country, or delivered with sonorous elocution and vehement gesticulation for the benefit of his companions.” This is the first indication I can find of his oratorical gifts, and that natural magniloquence of style which belonged equally to his mind and person.’—Vol. i. p. 31.

The long interval between the university and the ministry Irving filled up with the occupation most usually resorted to by the Scotch youth in such circumstances. He took to teaching. His first situation was at Haddington, to which place he had a favourable introduction from Sir John Leslie, Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh. Frank, buoyant, robust himself, Irving won the love and respect of his pupils.

While at Haddington an interesting episode occurs in his

faded and were afterwards restored. It is singular, however, that this should have been the only instance of such restoration. There are many instances where the lines made by the first hand have faded, and have not been restored; none, except this alleged case, where they have.

We do not propose, on the present occasion, to give further specimens of the peculiar readings which are to be found in the fragments of the New Testament contained in this manuscript. To do this with anything like completeness would very far transgress the limits of a single article. Moreover, the labour would seem to be superfluous, inasmuch as the readings in the Ephraem Rescript are, and have long been, accessible to the public in a variety of ways. We have before alluded to the length of time, during which the two volumes named at the head of this article have been published; in these two volumes we have the entire text; but the readings may be found in the editions of the New Testament put forth by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and (to the end of the Gospels) by Tregelles.¹

We therefore proceed to notice very briefly the contents of the volume which contains the fragments of the Old Testament. The materials which the restored manuscript furnishes towards the text of the LXX. version are very valuable, but (alas!) very scanty.

The portion in which the fragments of the Old Testament are contained, was written by a different hand from that employed in writing the New Testament, but is probably of the same date. It perhaps never contained more than the five poetical books, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song, together with the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach. These are all written stichometrically, as they are in the Alexandrine MS. But even of these we have but fragments remaining. They are enumerated by Professor Tischendorf in the Prolegomena to his edition of the Rescript, and of the LXX. The Psalms are entirely lost. Nineteen leaves contain all that now remains from the Book of Job. The fragments of the Proverbs occupy six leaves; those of Ecclesiastes eight leaves. One leaf is all that remains of the Song. The Wisdom of Solomon is in seven leaves. Siracides has fared better, the remains occupying twenty-three leaves.

A few of the inscriptions and subscriptions have escaped the ravages of time, and of the *rescribens*. Chiefly noticeable are the subscription to the Book of Proverbs, *παροιμια σολομωντος*

¹ We earnestly hope that Dr. Tregelles may be enabled to finish his valuable and beautifully executed edition of the New Testament; and that the Government will lend a favourable ear to the petition, which has, as we understand, been addressed in his behalf.

παρα εβδομηκοντα; the inscription to the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus, προλογος σιραχ; and the inscription to the Book of Ecclesiasticus, σοφια ιησου υιου σιραχ.

The fragments of the Old Testament contain the following forms of words, which more or less illustrate the same, or similar forms, found in the older MSS. of the New Testament.

Consonants are sometimes doubled, as φθαννει—διαβεννεις (διαβαινεις)—βαλλαντιον—αποκτεινι (αποκτεινι). Vowels are changed, as τεσσερα—αροτριουντας—καλαμουμενος—χρειοφιλετου (χρεωφειλετου)—ολεθρευων. The augment is sometimes neglected, as μεταβαλλετο—ενκεντριζοντο—προσκαλεσαμην—ευοδωσεν—διορθωθησαν—εορακα. The augment is sometimes doubled or transposed, ηγαυριωντο—επαρεκαλουν—επροφητευσεν—διηνεωκτο—διηυλαβουντο—ηυλογησεν—ηυφρανθη. The letter ν is sometimes added to the accusative singular in such words as ασεβην (Sirac. xlii. 2), χειραν (Wisd. xi. 20). Instances of this usage are found in the Alexandrine MS., e.g. τιναν (Luke xxi. 2), ποδηρην (Rev. i. 13), received into the text by Tischendorf, and by Lachmann in his smaller edition. Aspirates are sometimes neglected, as ουκ ο φοβος—ουκ ευρεθησαν, &c. In αφηλπισεν we have a converse instance, but this, perhaps, arises from the practice of the later Greek, in adding an aspirate to ελπις, as ελπις. Instances occur of conjunctions followed by unusual moods, as ινα επαποστρεφονται—ινα δεσποζει—εως συντριψη και ανταποδιδωσι—μηποτε ποιηση και καταισχυνει—ινα ευοδωσει—εαν ενπιστευσει—μη καταδεσμευσεις—ινα κοπιασει.

The general character of the LXX. text in the Ephraem Rescript seems to hold a middle place between that of the Alexandrine and that of the Vatican MSS. It very often agrees with the Alexandrine against the Vatican, especially in Job, Proverbs, the Song, Ecclesiastes; less frequently in Siracides; much less so in Wisdom. But on the other hand, there are many instances where the text of the Rescript supports the Vatican against the Alexandrine; and there are other instances where it differs from them both. The peculiar readings are found mostly in the apocryphal books.

Before we conclude our remarks, it may be as well to warn those who may have occasion to consult either of the two volumes to which we have ventured to call the reader's attention, that they must be on their guard against certain misprints, which have been pointed out by Professor Tischendorf himself. Corrections of misprints in the text of the New Testament will be found in the Prolegomena to the Fragments of the LXX. (§ 12, pp. 10, 11), and in the Prolegomena to the Professor's edition of the New Testament, p. clxxviii. note.

Corrections of misprints in the Fragments of the LXX. will be found in the Prolegomena to the Professor's edition of the LXX. (p. lxxxiv. note 1).

We may be permitted to remark, in conclusion, that documents such as these have a philological as well as a theological value. They exhibit the Greek language under one of its most peculiar phases—when influences of various kinds, and coming from various quarters, were acting upon it. Macedonian forces, combined with Oriental forms of thought and modes of speech, are here seen in operation, as they were at Alexandria fourteen hundred years ago. We mark the curious changes in spelling, and the intrusion of forms, some of which are (strictly speaking) ungrammatical. The living truths of Christianity did not require the high polish of Attic diction for their safe transmission, though Athens has had her full share in preparing the language in which they were to be perpetuated.

ART. III.—*The Life of Edward Irving.* By MRS. OLIPHANT.
Two Vols. London. 1862.

THE public owes a debt of gratitude to any one who calls its attention to the life and acts of a man whose half-forgotten, perhaps more than half-misunderstood, character had considerable influence upon the religious thought of his time, and still exercises sway over a portion of society. Under such an obligation has Mrs. Oliphant laid the public by her '*Life of Edward Irving*.' We may be surprised, but we cannot regret, that the task of writing Irving's biography had not been undertaken long ago; had not been performed as a 'labour of love' by some one of the many ardent followers who gathered round this remarkable leader.¹ We say we cannot regret it, because while another pen could hardly have done the work with greater success, with more grace, with fuller justice, certainly an earlier time would have been too early for giving forth Edward Irving's life with the best advantage to the world. It is true that, in a general way, the lives of men ought to be written as soon as they have ceased to live, and while the personal recollections of friends are still fresh and accurate. It is true that lapse of time dims the memory, confuses facts, effaces impressions. Boswell is the prince of biographers, and, for ordinary cases, the more like Boswell a biographer is, the better fitted is he for his work. But Irving's is not an ordinary life. The minute incident, the fragments of conversation, the telling anecdote, which give to a common biography its chief value, are but of subordinate importance in the life of Irving; they tell us nothing of what we most want to know—of how his wonderful mind struggled against the trammels of a narrow theology, now breaking loose into ways, which some called heresy, now rising to doctrinal heights, and bringing upon himself the odium of popish, at least of prelatial, leanings. Visionary, enthusiast, fanatic, im-

¹ We, of course, are aware that many sketches of Irving, of more or less merit, exist. Besides the articles in biographical dictionaries and encyclopedias (which, so far as we are acquainted with them, repeat with a dull monotony the same distorted opinions of the man, proceeding, as they mostly do, from the pens of Presbyterian ministers—the very worst possible judges in the matter), there are distinct attempts at a *Life*—among which that by Mr. Washington Wilks, though pretending to little, accomplishes much—may be mentioned. But there is not one which can in any way be considered as preoccupying the ground which Mrs. Oliphant has so admirably appropriated.

postor, such were the names with which he was abundantly stigmatized by his contemporaries; and it may be laid down as a canon of literature, that the biography of a man, whose conduct and opinions brought such censures upon him during his lifetime, ought not to be written till the generation which bestowed them has passed away. For this reason do we assert that if Irving's life had been written sooner, it would have been written too soon. Whatever truth there may be in the poet's proverb—

‘Men’s evil manners live in brass; their virtues
We write in water;’

it does not apply to theological misdemeanours or doctrinal offences. Time quickly floats into oblivion the vagaries of opinion to which extraordinary minds may have given way, or which a vulgar outcry may have goaded them to utter. But the discoveries in the region of truth, which they may have made, are cherished and acknowledged by a grateful posterity. Not that we wish to prejudge the questions which will have to be discussed in the present paper. Our sole purpose in making them has been to insure to our own and to the reader's minds a healthy state in which to approach our subject. We feel, and we wish the reader to feel, that some precaution is needful in order to free oneself of the bias, either on one side or the other, which the attitude of Irving towards Catholic truth, or the attitude of the Kirk towards Irving, so strongly tends to incumber the mind.

Edward Irving was born at Annan, in Dumfriesshire, on the 4th August, 1792. His parents belonged to that class in society from which the Kirk for the most part draws her ministers. His father, Gavin Irving, was a tanner by trade; by descent (maternally) of an Albigensian stock. His mother, Mary Lowther, was a woman handsome in person, high in spirit, both which qualities her son Edward, as also his brothers, inherited in full measure. His education began at what we should call a dame's school, kept by one Peggy Paine, a kinswoman of the notorious Tom Paine. Thence he passed on to the Annan Academy, a school which under this pretentious title did that good service to the natives which Scotch country middle class schools do in a more marked way than the corresponding schools in England. It is noticeable how far oftener in after life, and how much more warmly, Scotchmen speak of their old school and their old schoolmasters and mates than do Englishmen. These country schools in Scotland give, or at least used to give, sound learning to the lads of the country side, sending the most part of them to farm, or to be ‘merchants’ (as tradesmen are grandly called in the phrase of the North), well grounded in the be-

ginnings of Latin, and Greek, and mathematics. This general spread of the roots of what might be cultivated into higher learning gives the Scotch yeoman and tradesman an intellectual superiority much to be admired, notwithstanding the occasional pedantry which it is apt to breed. From these schools, too, a boy of superior promise is drafted off through the university to one of the learned professions. A youth of parts is singled out to delight his father with the hope—than which nothing can be more flattering to the pride of the Scotch yeoman—of seeing his son ‘wag his pow in a pu’pit o’ his ain.’ Whether Gavin was fired by this ambition we know not. But the academy at Annan had no mean boast that it sent forth the Irvings, and after them Thomas Carlyle. Not that Edward Irving gave much promise at school. There is no record of his distinguishing himself among his fellows. And no wonder. Genius seldom stands at the top of the class; talent often; industry oftener still.

At thirteen Irving went to Edinburgh to pass over the curriculum of a Scotch university. From a lad he grew into a youth without having called forth any special remark, so far as record goes. At the age of seventeen he completed his course—a creditable, uneventful course—by taking his A.M. degree. Of his doings and habits during this period, one incident only is noteworthy. He made acquaintance with, and made himself owner of, Hooker’s ‘Ecclesiastical Polity.’ This, in itself, trifling fact, is important as giving an early intimation of a tendency of his mind, the fuller development of which in later years we shall have to remark upon. In after life he used to speak of ‘the venerable companion of my early days, Richard Hooker.’ One more forecast of future things we may take from this college time:—

“He used to carry continually in his waistcoat pocket,” says one of his few surviving college companions, the Rev. Dr. Grierson, of Errol, “a miniature copy of Ossian; passages from which he read or recited in his walks in the country, or delivered with sonorous elocution and vehement gesticulation for the benefit of his companions.” This is the first indication I can find of his oratorical gifts, and that natural magniloquence of style which belonged equally to his mind and person.”—Vol. i. p. 31.

The long interval between the university and the ministry Irving filled up with the occupation most usually resorted to by the Scotch youth in such circumstances. He took to teaching. His first situation was at Haddington, to which place he had a favourable introduction from Sir John Leslie, Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh. Frank, buoyant, robust himself, Irving won the love and respect of his pupils.

While at Haddington an interesting episode occurs in his

history. One Dr. Welsh had a little daughter for whom he designed a learned rather than a polite education, and to this end engaged the services of the young master of the mathematical school. The little pupil was equal to the occasion, as was the tutor; and the proud father was delighted to find his pet's budding talent so cordially nurtured by the young Edinburgh graduate. A friendship soon sprung up between Irving and the Doctor:—

‘The youth who entered his house under such circumstances soon became a favourite guest at the fireside of the Doctor, who, himself a man of education and intelligence, and of that disposition which makes men beloved, was not slow to find out the great qualities of his young visitor. There are some men who seem born to the inalienable good fortune of lighting upon the best people—“the most worthy” according to Irving’s own expression long afterwards—wherever they go. Irving’s happiness in this way began at Haddington. The Doctor’s wife seems to have been one of those fair, sweet women whose remembrance lasts longer than greatness. There is no charm of beauty more delightful than that fragrance of it which lingers for generations in the place where it has been an unconsciously refining and tender influence. The Annandale youth came into a little world of humanizing graces when he entered that atmosphere; and it was only natural that he should retain the warmest recollection of it throughout his life. It must have been of countless benefit to him in this early stage of his career. The main quality in himself which struck observers was in strong and strange contradiction to the extreme devotion of *belief* manifested in his latter years—the critical and almost sceptical tendency of his mind, impatient of superficial “received truths,” and eager for proof and demonstration of everything. Perhaps mathematics, which then reigned paramount in his mind, were to blame; he was as anxious to discuss, to prove and disprove, as a Scotch student fresh from college is naturally disposed to be. It was a peculiarity natural to his age and condition; and as his language was always inclined to the superlative, and his feelings invariably took part in every matter which commended itself to his mind, it is probable that this inclination showed with a certain exaggeration to surrounding eyes. “This youth will scrape a hole in everything he is called on to believe,” said the Doctor;—a strange prophecy, looking at it by that light of events which unfold so many unthought-of meanings in all predictions.’—Vol. i. pp. 40, 41.

Thus two years passed at Haddington, years during which, every now and then, appeared signs of future greatness, of future eccentricity, we must also say, of future sorrow. Let the following extract show what we mean:—

“Social supper parties,” says Mr. Alexander Inglis, “were much the custom at this time in Haddington, and the hospitalities generally extended far into the night. At these social meetings Irving was occasionally in the habit of broaching some of his singular opinions about the high destinies of the human race in heaven, where the saints were not only to be made “kings and priests unto God,” but were to rule and judge angels. Dr. Lorimer (the senior minister of the town) used to hint that there were many more profitable and useful subjects in the New Testament for a divinity student to occupy his thoughts about than such speculations; but Irving was not to be put down in this way. “Dare either you or I deprive God of the glory and thanks due to His name for this exceeding great reward?” cried the impetuous young man, according to the report of his old friend. The good Doctor’s ready reply was, “Well,

well, my dear friend, both you and I can be saved without knowing about that."—Vol. i. pp. 44, 45.

We cannot dismiss this period without noticing that during it the name of Chalmers first crosses the pages of Irving's life. He walked to Edinburgh, eighteen miles distant, to hear the already famous Chalmers preach at S. George's.

From Haddington Irving went to Kirkcaldy, at the invitation of its chief inhabitants, to take the mastership of the school which had just been instituted there. The pupils of this school used to call each other 'Irvingites.' Would that there had never been other than this fond, playful use for the word! He remained at Kirkcaldy seven years, in which events, or germs of events, important to him meet us. His future wife, at first his pupil, was Isabella, the eldest daughter of the Rev. John Martin, the parish minister. (We ought to explain that even in the better Scotch schools at that time, boys and girls were taught together, sitting on the same forms.) He was licensed to preach in 1815, and so began to change from a layman into a minister, a somewhat slow process in the Kirk. His first sermon was delivered at Annan, his native place:—

'The "haill-toun," profoundly critical and much interested, turned out to hear him; even his ancient teachers, with solemn brows, came out to sit in judgment on Edward's sermon. A certain excitement of interest, unusual to that humdrum atmosphere, thrilled through the building. When the sermon was in full current, some incautious movement of the young preacher tilted aside the great Bible, and the sermon itself, that direful "paper" which Scotch congregations hold in high despite, dropped out bodily, and fluttered down upon the precentor's desk underneath. A perfect rustle of excitement ran through the church; here was an un hoped-for crisis! What would the neophyte do now? The young preacher calmly stooped his great figure over the pulpit, grasped the manuscript as it lay, broadways, crushed it up in his great hand, thrust it into a pocket, and went on as fluently as before.'—Vol. i. p. 66.

But to this flash succeeded darkness. During his stay at Kirkcaldy, and for long after, he failed to make himself 'acceptable.' He brooded gloomily in Kirkcaldy church over the common-place outpourings which obtained the ears shut to his own addresses. He could not brook imitation of approved preachers, and the people would not suffer their propriety to be shocked by his genius. It is to be doubted whether he would ever have attained the fame in his own land which he reached across the border. His fellow-countrymen, perhaps, would never have originated the applause which they were forced to echo after it had swelled forth in England.

One incident falling in this probation-time may be quoted as an example of Irving's greatest moral failing—hot and impatient temper. The debate on pluralities was to be held in the General Assembly, and Chalmers was to lead the attack.

Irving went with the crowds to hear this all-interesting subject discussed, fought over, we should rather say, by that grave body in S. Giles' Church:—

'The Old Assembly Aisle afforded but very limited accommodation, and the students' gallery was understood to be occupied by some persons not of their body. At this Irving felt great indignation. He remonstrated with the door-keeper, but in vain; he demanded entrance for himself and others who were excluded; and when no attention was, or perhaps could be, paid by that official, he put his shoulder to the narrow door, and, applying his Herculean strength to it, fairly wrenched it off its hinges! The crash interrupted the proceedings of the court, and produced both surprise and diversion; but no redress of grievances.'—Vol. i. p. 74.

But school-keeping was not Irving's vocation, although for one so young (he was twenty-six, and had been master of the Kirkcaldy Academy seven years) he had not been unsuccessful. He grew weary of it, and abandoned it, determined to wait in gloomy expectation for a 'call.' He went to Edinburgh, and took lodgings. There he extended and deepened his education. He took up French and Italian, also chemistry and natural history, by way of garnishings to the main subject, Divinity. Carlyle was among his companions at this time, and, with him, member of a debating society, called the Philosophical Association. Meanwhile he took himself seriously in hand upon the matter of preaching. His unacceptableness had not won him over to the popular notions of what was correct and sound, but had rather intensified in him the determination to perfect and work out his own convictions as to what preaching ought to be. He destroyed all his old discourses, and proceeded to compose new ones, aiming at what he deemed the right idea. So time wore on, and yet no call. Soon he must bestir himself for very need. If his country rejected him, he would leave it; he would go abroad, and, after the primitive apostolic manner, carry the Gospel to the heathen. He looked eastwards, and fixed on Persia, and applied himself to acquiring the language. Just at this time a beam of hope shone upon him. He was invited to preach at S. George's for Dr. Andrew Thomson, and before Dr. Chalmers. It might be that the latter wanted an assistant. He preached, won applause, but nothing more. He waited only to grow again despairing, and once more turn his thoughts eastward. He set out to bid friends and kin farewell, but by mistake stepped into the wrong boat, and only just escaped being carried off by it. He resolved to take the next, go whither it might. It took him to Belfast. He wandered over the north of Ireland in an aimless way, and was recalled to the purposes of life by a letter from his father, inclosing one from Dr. Chalmers, asking him to visit him at Glasgow. He started forthwith, and the result was an engagement as the great

Doctor's assistant at S. John's. And now, surely Irving had his heart's desire? Surely the 10,000 people in the parish of S. John's, Glasgow, afforded a field wide enough for his most ambitious energies? We shall see that it was not so: of this, however, more presently. A word ought to be said about his exact status. He was a 'probationer:' i.e. a man intended for the ministry, passed through all the needful educational course, and licensed to preach; but nothing more. He was not yet ordained by the Presbytery, which could not take place till he had received a 'call' from a parish or congregation, and then not unless there was certainty of maintenance. And now a glance at the 'probationer' himself. He was a dark, well-made man of some six feet two inches, or four, in height, with a face remarkably handsome, saving the unhappy outward squint in the right eye, which gave rise afterwards to the coarse newspaper gibes about 'Dr. Squintum.' His commanding presence was made the more impressive by a solemn dignity of manner. He had high thoughts of his office, and he made others think highly of it. When he entered a house, he pronounced the apostolic greeting, 'Peace be to this house.' He would lay his hand on the children's heads, and bless them with priestly gravity. By letter, as by word of mouth, all through his life he was wont to pronounce a benediction in the name of the Trinity. The solemn form in which these acts were done surprised the Presbyterians, so little accustomed to form or solemnity. And yet, off duty, he was full of spirits and merriment; enjoying fun, and making it.¹

When Irving went to Glasgow, the city was in an unquiet state from lack of work and food. Among the people radicalism muttered evil forebodings. Irving was no radical, but where want was, there his kind heart poured itself forth. He went fearlessly among the discontented poor, and how he found them, and what he thought of them, let him explain in a letter to his sister:—

'If I should report from my daily ministrations among the poorest class, and the worst reported-of class of our population, I should deliver an opinion so favourable as it would be hardly safe for myself to deliver, lest I should be held a *radical* likewise. Now the truth is, I have visited about three hundred families, and have met with the kindest welcome, and entertainment, and invitations. Nay, more, I have entered on the tender subject of their present sufferings, in which they are held so ferocious, and have found them in general both able and willing to entertain the religious lesson and improvement arising out of it. This may arise from the way of setting it forth, which I endeavour to make with the utmost tenderness and feeling, as well is due, when you see people in the midst of nakedness and starvation. Yet we are armed against them to the teeth; and the alarm took so generally that, for all my convictions and knowledge, I had engaged a horse-pistol to stand out in defence of my own castle like a true Englishman!'—Vol. i. pp. 104, 105.

¹ See Dr. Hanna's '*Life of Dr. Chalmers*,' vol. ii. p. 290.

He was ever ready to spend and to be spent for his people. A small legacy gave him the means he had not before possessed of relieving the needy. He changed it all into one-pound notes, and armed himself with one as he went forth each day on his rounds, until the whole was spent. Thus zealous, loving, ever ready, he worked among the people in what way soever his chief appointed him.

But all this while the longings and dreams of the dreary days at Edinburgh seemed to be no nearer their fulfilment. His preaching was accepted on the recommendation that it was from the great Doctor's 'helper.' But the congregation at S. John's had no wider capacities than other congregations, and could not take in and understand two great men at once. If Chalmers was not to preach, many would turn away, saying, 'it was no himself.' Again missionary visions crossed his mind; but the hour of release was come at last. The 'call' (and to Irving the word had a deeper meaning than lay in its hackneyed sense) came from the Caledonian Chapel, Hatton Garden. It was accepted. He went home to Annan on a farewell visit, and while there wrote a letter to his friend Mr. David Hope, a paragraph from which we must quote for the sake of its own beauty; of its sentiments we may feel a little incredulous, knowing how long Irving had yearned for a fair field for the power he felt within him. But Irving was pre-eminently a candid man, and, like all candid men, spoke out what was to him, at the time of utterance, truth:—

'I am snugly seated in this Temple of Indolence, and very loath to be invaded by any of the distractions of the busy city. I would fain devote myself to the enjoyment of our home and family, and to meditate from a distance the busy scene I have left, and the more busy scene to which I am bound. My mind seems formed for inactivity. I can saunter the whole day from field to field, riding on impressions and the transient thoughts they awaken, with no companion of books or men, saving, perhaps, a little nephew or niece in my hand.'—Vol. i. p. 146.

Before we follow him to London, we must say a few words about the position in which he and Chalmers stood to each other. Once and again does Mrs. Oliphant express her surprise at Chalmers' treatment of Irving. We confess we see no cause for wonder, though some for regret. No two minds could be so great, and yet so different. This difference is partly, and only partly, lit off by the head page title, 'The Statesman and the Visionary.' When Chalmers is placed as the statesman by the side of Irving as the visionary, the contrast expressed by the words does not account for the utter unlikeness between the men. Visionaries and statesmen are sometimes found to complement each other. The visionary spins theories which the statesman can sometimes (without acknowledging the

debt, perhaps) turn to account. But then the visionary and statesman must stand on the same level. Chalmers and Irving stood on different levels. Chalmers handled philosophy, so did Irving; but the philosophy of Chalmers was moral, the philosophy of Irving aspired to be celestial. Chalmers was a great orator, Irving was an orator greater still; but the oratory of Chalmers laboured to bring high things down to the reach of practical men; the oratory of Irving desired to lift practical men up to high things, and, failing that, went straight up into the lofty regions without them, leaving his hearers to gaze wonderingly at the orator as he soared into the effulgent, but hazy distance. No doubt Chalmers did not understand Irving; who among his contemporaries did? None, not even his ardent followers. He was one of those men whom, to understand, you must look at from a distance of time. While all misunderstood him, some were overcome by his influence, and became his disciples; others were not impressed, but only perplexed, by the strange and lofty career of his mind, and cooled off from him, half in pity, half in vexation. Chalmers was amongst these. One cannot help sympathising with Mrs. Oliphant in her evident, though mildly expressed displeasure, at Chalmers' icy reserve from his former assistant, and ever reverent and affectionate admirer. It was not kind in Chalmers to pay no heed to Irving's earnest entreaty in his doctrinal trouble. But it was highly prudent.¹

Small and obscure, indeed, was the 'charge' to which Irving came; in the whole of London, perhaps, there was no conventicle more insignificant than the Caledonian Chapel, Hatton Garden. The neighbourhood was plebeian, its circumstances were poor and precarious, but, by a strange caprice of fortune, the very fact of its unendowed poverty caused the fame of its new minister to be noised among the great ones in high places. The anecdote is worth repeating:—

'Sir James Mackintosh had been by some unexpected circumstance led to hear the new preacher, and heard Irving in his prayer describe an unknown family of orphans belonging to the obscure congregation, as now "thrown upon the fatherhood of God." The words seized upon the mind of the philosopher, and he repeated them to Canning, who "started," as Mackintosh relates, and, expressing great admiration, made an instant engagement to accompany his

¹ We own we cannot comprehend Mrs. Oliphant, even as consistent with herself, when she says: 'It is creditable to both parties to note how they mutually sought each other's assistance at such eventful movements of their life.' (She alludes to Chalmers' introduction of Irving to his charge at Hatton Garden.) Irving, indeed, resorted to his 'dear master,' 'his honoured friend,' again and again as each fresh cloud came up from the horizon of his life; but we find no trace of Chalmers resorting to Irving. It is true that the adored of all Scotland, the man on whom was concentrated whatever of enthusiasm the cold Northerners possessed, had small need of the sympathy of his distant brother.

friend to the Scotch church on the following Sunday. Shortly after, a discussion took place in the House of Commons, in which the revenues of the Church were referred to, and the necessary mercantile relation between high talent and good pay insisted upon. No doubt it suited the statesman's purpose to instance, on the other side of the question, the little Caledonian chapel and its new preacher. Canning told the House that, so far from universal was this rule, that he himself had lately heard a Scotch minister, trained in one of the most poorly endowed of Churches, and established in one of her outlying dependencies, possessed of no endowment at all, preach the most eloquent sermon that he had ever listened to. The curiosity awakened by this speech is said to have been the first beginning of that invasion of "Society" which startled Hatton Garden out of itself.—Vol. i. pp. 158, 159.

Irving was now fairly launched on that treacherous sea of popularity which so often lifts up those who intrust themselves to it upon the crest of its highest wave, only to ruin their steerage tackle, and drift them into its yawning trough, there to await destruction in helplessness. No preacher before or since has created such excitement. In the year 1823 he published his famous Orations. If it were part of our business to take notice of Irving's writings, we might point out in this first volume passages of unsurpassed eloquence, thoughts of exquisite beauty, sentences breathing poetry of the loftiest kind. We could quote, too, vigorous exposures of the cheats with which men will delude themselves, of the frauds which eat hollow the heart of society. Although the volume is disfigured with much turgidness of style, yet it contains plain precepts and practical truths set forth in the simplest words. At the same time, we could cite places where the orator sweeps into a statement which it would not be difficult for an enemy to denounce as a heresy. We could quote expressions which, whatever *we* may think of them, can scarcely be compressed within the narrow limits of the 'Westminster Confession.' The book obtained immense popularity, and, of course, immense censure. A third edition was demanded in October, although the book first appeared only in July. In publishing this volume, Irving bared himself to the critics,—

‘He reared his head in a cloud of poisonous flies.’

But he did worse. In the preface to the third edition he betrayed, by his anger, that he felt their stings.

But we are anticipating the order of events. Before this angry preface was fired off, Irving went to Scotland to claim as his bride Isabella, the eldest daughter of the Rev. John Martin, minister of Kirkcaldy. They were married on the 13th of October, 1823.

Irving took to wife a woman whose constancy had stood the test of years of betrothal, during which shadows and changeable lights of doubt and hope had crossed her lover's path; and who, henceforth, was to cling to him devotedly while he grew giddy

on the pinnacle of success, and at last should totter from it a conspicuous victim (to borrow an expression from his great friend's *éloge*) of 'fashion's foul incense.'

When he returned to London we find him becoming more and more intimate with Mr. Basil Montagu, and through him getting introduced to Coleridge. Mr. Montagu may have influenced Irving to the extent to which Irving, with his usual readiness to acknowledge an obligation, says he did, in the dedication to him and Mrs. Montagu of his lectures on the Parable of the Sower. But that Coleridge influenced Irving there can be little doubt. His was a mind most susceptible of the power which the philosopher of Highgate brought to bear upon all around him. It was open enough to receive his impressions: it was great enough to appreciate them; and it just had that tendency towards the mystical and the profound which would find a congenial spirit in Coleridge. Irving expatiates upon the benefits he received from his intercourse with the poet, in his dedication to him of his Missionary Oration. In it he says, 'You have been more profitable to my faith in orthodox doctrine, to my spiritual understanding of the Word of God, and to my right conception of the Christian Church, than any or all the men with whom I have entertained friendship and conversation.' It certainly seems wonderful to us now, as he himself admitted it would seem to many then, that he should select Coleridge as the object of a dedicatory epistle to a missionary sermon. But this strange fact goes far to explain many other subsequent facts, which would otherwise be more strange still.

Irving's great labours began to tell upon his health of body, also (which is more noteworthy here) upon his health of mind. This appears in a letter of his dated February, 1824, concerning a preface he had promised to write to an edition of Gilpin's works:—

'I am at present worked beyond my strength, and you know that is not inconsiderable. "My head! my head!" I may say with the Shunamite child.'

But he pushed on heeding no warnings, no obstacles. In the course of the year he preached for the London Missionary Society a sermon which enraged the Committee, amazed the audience, and now remains, in its enlarged form, a witness to his fatal want of tact and judgment; albeit, a monument of his eloquence. It raised a tempest, and in every tempest Irving, instead of discreetly hiding his head till its fury was past, rose to it and made his voice to be heard at its loudest. By way of proclaiming his contempt of popular opinion, he dedicated, as we have said, the printed oration to Coleridge. And yet Irving was happy through all. His happiness makes itself appear in the unfeigned joy with which he hails domestic bless-

ings. A son was born to him in this same year; the little Edward, who was to live just long enough to draw forth his father's deepest love, and then depart, leaving a lasting wound in his father's heart.

The old chapel in Hatton Garden had long been insufficient for the overflowing attendances; a new one was built in Regent Square. Upon this subject Mrs. Oliphant writes:—

'In the middle of the summer, just two years, as he himself tells us, from the time of his coming, the foundation-stone of his new church was laid. It was planned of a size conformable to the reputation of the preacher. This event was celebrated by Irving in three sermons—one preached before, another after, and a third on occasion of the ceremony—in which last he takes pains to describe the discipline and practice of that Church of Scotland which stood always highest in his affections; but, at the same time, speaks of the building about to be erected in terms more like those that might be used by a Jew in reference to his temple, or by a Catholic of his holy shrine, than by Presbyterian lips, which acknowledge no consecration of place. Doubtless the sublimation which everything encountered in his mind, the faculty he had of raising all emotions into the highest regions, and of covering even the common with an ideal aspect unknown to itself, may have raised the expressions of a simple sentiment of reverence into this consecrating halo which his word threw around the unbuilt church; but it must not be forgotten that from his very outset a certain priestly instinct was in the man who bade "Peace be to this house" in every dwelling he entered, and who gave his benediction, as well as his prayers, like a primitive pope, or bishop, as indeed he felt himself to be.'—Vol. i. p. 215.

In like manner the duties accompanying the increased congregation called for some more organized system of management. Consequently an eldership was established.

Thus things went on, carrying us into the year 1825, 'a year,' as his biographer truly says, 'ever to be remembered in Irving's life.' For it was at the beginning of this year that his attention was turned to the subject of prophecy: it was in this year that he sighted the rock upon which he was ultimately to make such grievous shipwreck. Mr. Hartley Frere, himself an enthusiast in this line of study, lured Irving on to the fatal pursuit. A sermon for the Continental Society, of which Henry Drummond was the chief supporter, was the occasion which brought his mind to bear upon prophetic speculations. It is remarkable that, notwithstanding the great offence he had given to the London Missionary Society, he should be sought after to preach for other societies. But there was a fascination about him which they could not resist. Besides the Continental Society, the Highland School Society and the Hibernian Society enlisted his eloquence, and the result in each case was that he got into more or less of hot water with the 'religious world' upon the question as to what a 'charity sermon' ought to be.

And now a shadow was to cross his path, whose gloom was

never wholly to pass away. The little Edward, who had dragged on a feeble existence, finally sank down and died, after a sickly life of fifteen months. The stroke laid bare the tenderness of Irving's nature. He announced the event to a friend in the following touching letter:—

'Our dearly beloved Friend,—The hand of the Lord hath touched my wife and me, and taken from us our well-beloved child, sweet Edward, who was dear to you also as he was to all who knew him. But before taking him, He gave unto us good comfort of the Holy Ghost, as He doth to all His faithful servants; and we are comforted, verily we are comforted. Let the Lord be praised, who hath visited the lowly and raised them up!

'If you had been here yesterday, and this day when our little babe was taken, you would have seen the stroke of death subdued by faith, and the strength of the grave overcome; for the Lord hath made His grace to be known unto us in the inward part. I feel that the Lord hath well done in that He hath afflicted me, and that by His grace, I shall be a more faithful minister unto you, and unto all the flock committed to my charge. Now is my heart broken—now is its hardness melted; and my pride is humbled, and my strength is renewed. The good name of the Lord be praised!

'Our little Edward, dear friend, is gone the way of all the earth; and his mother and I are sustained by the Prince and Saviour who hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. The affection which you bear to us, or did bear towards the dear child who is departed, we desire that you will not spend it in unavailing sorrow, but elevate it unto Him who hath sustained our souls, even the Lord our Saviour Jesus Christ; and if you feel grief and trouble, oh, turn the edge of it against sin and Satan to destroy their works, for it is they who have made us to drink of this bitter cup.

'Communicate this to all our friends in the congregation and church, as much as may be, by the perusal of this letter, that they may know the grace of God manifested unto us; and oh, William Hamilton, remember thyself, and tell them all that they are dust, and that their children are as the flowers of the field.'—Vol. i. p. 245.

The life of this little one had deepened Irving's views upon a subject concerning which it is important to note his opinions. In a letter to his wife he expresses himself upon the Sacrament of Baptism thus:—

'I pray you, my dear Isabella, to bear in mind that he has been consecrated to God by the sacrament of Baptism, whereby Christ did assure to our faith the death of his body of sin, and the life of his spirit of righteousness; and that he is to be brought up in the full faith and assurance of the fulfilment of this greatest promise and blessing, which our dear Lord hath bestowed upon our faith; wherefore adopt not the base notion into which many parents fall, of waiting for a future conversion and new birth, but regard that as fully promised to us from the beginning, and let all your prayers, desires, words, and thoughts towards the child proceed accordingly. For I think that we are all grown virtually adult baptists, whatever we be professedly, in that we take no comfort or encouragement out of the sacrament. Let it not be so with you, whom God hath set to be a mother in Israel.'—Vol. i. p. 240.

The history of this year, from October, is given in a journal—the only journal—which Irving kept for the information of his wife, who remained during that time at Kirkcaldy. No extracts can do justice to this fragment of autobiography. We commend

it to the reader as being a more truthful opening out of the writer's mind than journals, at least those of public men, usually are. We commend it, too, for its internal value, as the frank portraiture of the workings of a great and loving heart. We cannot, however, refrain from making one extract, because its subject-matter is essential to forming a correct notion of the nature and tendencies of Irving's mind :—

'Afterwards I addressed myself to Bishop Overall's Convocation Book, concerning the government of the Catholic Church, and the kingdoms of the whole world, which digests under short chapters the history of God's revelation, and appends a canon to each. In the first twenty-two of which chapters and canons I was astonished to find the full declaration of what had been dawning upon my mind, viz. : that the maxim which, since Locke's time, has been the basis of all government, "that all power is derived from the people, and held of the people for the people's good," is in truth the basis of all revolution and radicalism, and the dissolution of all government ; and that governors and judges, of whatever name, hold their place and authority of God for ends discovered in His word, even as people yield obedience to laws and magistrates by the same highest authority. Also it pleased me to find how late sprung is the notion among our levelling dissenters, that the magistrate hath no power in the Church, and how universal was the notion among the reformers and divines that the magistrate is bound to put down idolatry and will-worship, and provide for the right religious instruction of the people. That subject of toleration needs to be reconsidered ; the liberals have that question wholly their own way, and therefore I know there must be error in it : for where Satan is, there is confusion and every evil work.'—Vol. i. p. 257.

As time rolled on, Irving's views grew higher and wider. They drifted further and further away from the practical, and landed him in a cloud-land of ideality, wherein he wandered, seeming to himself to be making progress towards some distant, yet ever-retreating, goal ; but to the unenchanted observers, admiring, but not fascinated by his genius, too clearly losing himself in a maze of hopeless speculations, which had small value in themselves, but which arrested attention by the gorgeous dress of language and metaphor in which they were adorned by his eloquence.

We come now to a period in Irving's life which may be looked upon as critical. His natural proneness to dive into the mysteries of prophecy had received an impetus from the companionship of Mr. Frere. It was confirmed into a fixed, and cherished into a morbid, attitude of mind, by attendance at the meetings of what went by the name of the 'Albury School of the Prophets.' This consisted of a number of persons, lay and clerical, of various communions, but all united by one common curiosity about the hidden things of prophecy and the Apocalypse, who met (for the first time in Advent, 1826) for study and discussion. They were brought together by the invitation of Henry Drummond to Albury, and of this body

Irving, in his dedication to him of seven discourses on subjects national and prophetic, thus speaks:—"I have to address 'you as the head and representative of a small body of 'mistreated and patient men, who are looking out for the 'personal advent and reign of Christ, and endeavouring 'to win the Church and the world, whom you have assembled 'under your roof, and entertained in a most bountiful manner.' A full statement of the objects of these meetings, and an account of the mode of proceeding at them, are given by Irving, in his preface to 'Ben-Ezra,' a book which, more than all the rest of his works, throws strange light upon his character:—

'A Spanish work, entitled "The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty," professedly written by Juan Josafat Ben-Ezra, a Hebrew convert to Christianity, but in reality, according to the facts afterwards ascertained, the product of a Jesuit priest called Lacunza, was brought to him, as he describes in his preface to the translation of that work, by friends who had been specially impressed by his own views on the same subject. He found in it, as he declares, "the hand of a master," and not only so, but "the chief work of a master's hand;" and feeling assured that his God had sent this "masterpiece of reasoning" to him "at such a critical time, for the love of His Church, which He hath purchased with His own blood," he resolved "to weigh well how I might turn the gift to profit." The result of his ponderings was, that he undertook the translation of the book, concluding, after his fashion, that the Church was as open to receive instruction, wheresoever it came from, as he himself was.'—Vol. i. p. 330.

The readiness with which Irving acknowledged the Jesuit as a fellow-labourer in the field of prophecy, introducing him to English Protestants as a voice from the Roman Catholic Church, compared with his uncompromising denunciation, both in his writings and in his speeches, of the Roman Church as the Beast, and of the Pope as Antichrist, shows how independently he carried himself, not only of the traditions of a sect, but also of the simpering indifferentism which passes for tolerance. And here we may quote a passage from his preface to a volume of sermons, as further illustrating this feature of his character:—

'I have exercised myself much to discern the Apostasy, and to hold with it no communion or fellowship of any kind. This apostasy I perceive to be twofold; that of the sense, and that of the mind;—the former constituted into form by the Papacy, the latter constituting itself into form by the Socinianism and Neology of the Protestant Churches.'—*Sermons and Lectures*, vol. i. Preface, p. ix.

How far his translation of 'Ben-Ezra' can be reconciled with his determination 'to hold no communion or fellowship of any kind' with the 'Apostasy,' we do not pretend to settle. And so Irving, with the Jesuit 'Ben-Ezra' under his arm, resorted to the Albury Conferences, thereat to meet with as motley a group

of men (looking at them by the light of their subsequent history) as ever voluntarily assembled together for religious exercise. Among them were Joseph Wolff, Hugh McNeile, Vaughan of Leicester, Lewis Way, Dodsworth, Henry Drummond. How barren the 'school' was of any practical good, notwithstanding Irving's glowing description of its proceedings, may be gathered from an anecdote related by Mrs. Oliphant, and also in the 'Memoir of Robert Story of Rosneath,' which asserts that when the news of Napoleon's downfall, and of the death of the King of Rome, was received, one of the conclave, springing from his seat, exclaimed, 'That can't be true! that would overturn this whole interpretation;' and that when the fact was established beyond doubt, this gentleman took to his bed from vexation.

The wisdom, or the folly, of the Albury School can have small interest for anyone now. It is the dismal fate of all such speculations, that the course of time will inevitably bring them to ruin and contempt, no matter how great the learning and the labour which they may have cost. But the question as to what influence those conferences had upon Irving, and consequently what share they had in sowing the seed of the future 'Catholic and Apostolic Church,' is one of melancholy importance. We cannot now stop to answer it, if indeed it be capable of a definite answer; but must follow on with the course of events which will throw light upon it, though oftentimes crosswise and perplexing.

Again and again in Irving's life the reader is amazed at the wonderful association in his mind of lines of thought, which it might be supposed to be impossible for any mind to hold and pursue together. At the very time when he was working at 'Ben-Ezra,' and conferring at Albury, his thoughts were bent upon the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, and were maturing into views, which, notwithstanding his appeal to the Westminster Confession, were very wide of the opinions which reigned in the Westminster Assembly. His 'Lectures on Baptism' were the fruit of this period, although not published till 1828; and of what nature they were can best be ascertained from the dedication of them to his wife. We extract the following, on account of its personal, no less than its doctrinal, significance:—

'I believe in my heart that the doctrine of the Holy Sacraments, which is contained in these two little volumes, was made known to my mind, first of all, for the purpose of preparing us for the loss of our eldest boy; because on that very week you went with him to Scotland, whence he never returned, my mind was directed to meditate and preach these discourses upon the standing of the baptized in the Church, which form the sixth and seventh of the Homilies on Baptism. I believe it also, because, long before our little Edward was stricken by the hand of God in Scotland, I was led to open these views to you in letters,

which, by God's grace, were made efficacious to convince your mind. I believe it, further more, because the thought contained in the homilies remained in my mind like an unsprung seed, until it was watered by the common tears we shed over our dying Mary. From that time forth I felt that the truth concerning baptism, which had been revealed for our special consolation, was not for that end given, nor for that end to be retained; and therefore I resolved, at any risk, to open to all fathers and mothers of the Christian Church the thoughts which had ministered to us so much consolation.

'I desire most gratefully to acknowledge my obligations to the fathers of the Scottish Church, whose Confession of Faith concerning the Sacraments, and especially the sentence which I have placed as the motto of this book ["We utterly condemn the vanity of those who affirm sacraments to be nothing but naked and bare signs"], were, under God, made instrumental in opening to me the whole truth of Holy Scripture concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper; of which having been convinced, by God's blessing upon these words of my fathers in the Church, upon consulting the venerable companion of my early studies, Richard Hooker, I found such a masterly treatise upon the whole subject of the Sacraments that I scrupled not to rank as one of his disciples, and to prefer his exposition infinitely to my own; yet to both to prefer that sentence of our own Confessions which I have placed as the motto of my book. For this reason it is that I have reprinted those parts of Hooker's treatise which concern the doctrine of the Sacraments.'—Vol. i. p. 416.

No one who has observed Irving's career thus far will be surprised to learn that he drew down upon himself a charge of unsound doctrine. There were many elements in him provocative of such a charge. He was highly popular, and therefore envy would find it a safe indictment to lay against the orator. He was eloquent, and his eloquence was of a kind which spurned the ordinary trammels of style and proprieties of language, and consequently the calm and cautious thinkers were alarmed by his flights, and concluded that, because he got beyond their reach, he must be straying into heresy. He was zealous, and zeal itself is an offence from the penalties of which the cold and time-serving will only exempt a man on the score of insanity. He was a genius:

'Genius is master of man;
Genius does it what it must,'

and, in its efforts to do it, it not seldom is the ruin of the man whom it possesses; for, as genius is rare, it meets with few who can sympathize with it; and the many who do not understand it, from very fear of its power, seek to crush it. All these was Irving, and much more too. With respect to the charge of heresy, we at present say nothing.

There can be no doubt that a good deal of uneasiness was felt by many as to the tendency of Irving's opinions at this time; and it says nothing against this that the first definite accusation of unsoundness should be made by a person, certainly insignificant, and apparently a busybody. It is not always safe to estimate an opinion by its mouthpiece.

The mouthpiece here was an 'idle clergyman named Cole, 'who heard by the wind of rumour of what appeared to him "a 'new doctrine.'" The immediate cause was an address delivered 'by Irving in behalf of a society for the distribution of gospel 'tracts, in which some of his audience discovered that the 'preacher declared the human nature of our Saviour to be 'identical with all human nature, truly and in actual verity the 'seed of Abraham.' Cole went to hear for himself, and afterwards followed Irving into the vestry. Of this interview and of the manner in which it was met, let Irving himself speak in the preface to 'Christ's Holiness in the Flesh,' published in 1851:—

'Of the man I know nothing, save that a stranger once solicited conversation with me on a Lord's-day night, after public worship, of which conversation I found what purported to be the substance standing at the head of this publication (Cole's pamphlet). Whether it be so or not, I cannot tell, for it was at a moment of exhaustion that it was held; and I gave the stranger an invitation to come to me at leisure on the Thursday following, for the further satisfying of his conscience. He did not think it worth his while to do this; and could reconcile his conscience to the betrayal of pastoral and ministerial confidence, and to the publication of a conversation, without even asking me whether it was correctly reported or not. . . . I shall never forget the feeling that I had upon first hearing my name coupled with heresy. So much did it trouble me, that I once seriously meditated sending a paper to the *Christian Observer*, in order to contradict the man's false insinuations. But I thought it better to sit quiet, and bear the reproach. When, however, I perceived that this error was taking form, and that the Church was coming into peril of believing that Christ had no temptation in the flesh to contend with and overcome, I felt it my duty to intercalate, in the volume on the Incarnation, a sermon (No. III.) showing out the truth in a more exact and argumentative form, directed especially against the error that our Lord took human nature in its creation, and not in its fallen state. And another (No. VI.), showing the most grave and weighty conclusions flowing from the true doctrine that He came under the conditions of our fallen state, in order to redeem us from the same. This is the true and faithful account of the first work which I published upon the subject.'—Vol. ii. p. 8.

The immediate effect of this assault was slight, if, indeed, it took effect at all. Irving went on, unchecked, and set for himself a sort of mission journey to his own country, to proclaim there what, to him, was an all-surpassing truth, namely, the imminent advent of the Saviour. He set out in May (1828), and the account we have of his incessant labours—yet undertaken by way of recreation—is something prodigious. Wherever he went crowds gathered to hear him. He took Edinburgh by storm. Dr. Chalmers struggled for a place to hear his quondam assistant. He notes the fact in his journal thus:—

'For the first time heard Mr. Irving. I have no hesitation in saying it is quite woeful. There is power and richness, and gleams of exquisite beauty, but withal a mysterious and extreme allegorization, which, I am sure, must be pernicious to the general cause. He sent me a letter he had written to the king, on the

Test, &c. and begged that I would read every word of it before I spoke. I did so, and found it unsatisfactory and obscure, but not half so much so as his sermon.'—Vol. ii. p. 20.

Doubtless, the ideas of Irving, to whom the practical was nothing, would appear 'woeful' to Chalmers, to whom the practical was everything. At Kirkcaldy a sad accident—the falling of a gallery in the church, overcrowded to hear him, causing death and wounds to many—cast a shadow across his brilliant progress. He returned to London in July. The retrospect of his visit must, on the whole, have been gratifying to him. He had commanded the ear of thousands where, six years ago, he had failed to win the cordial attention of any.

He resumed with his wonted vigour his regular ministrations among his people, the exact nature of which is fully detailed in his letters to his wife, whom he left in Scotland. In one of these he gives an amusing fragment of the history of a still-existing religious newspaper, which it may be worth while to repeat, more especially as giving an insight into his opinion of the 'Evangelical' party, and of his own future:—

'There is a curious piece of information connected with the *Record* newspaper, which I resolved to communicate to you, in order to prepare you for that opposition which we are destined to from the religious world. It had come to a stand-still, and was going to be given up, when Mr. Drummond, and Haldane, and Lord Mandeville, and a few others, resolved to take it up, and make it a truly Christian paper, adopting *jure divino* doctrine with respect to Church and State at home, and the Protestant principles with respect to our foreign affairs, such as Cromwell taught Papal Europe to fear. The moment it was heard by the religious world (the Evangelical) that it was coming into the hands of such men, they rallied themselves, and subscribed plentifully, and resolved to carry it on. . . . Such is the idea entertained of us, and such is the present standing of the *Record* religious newspaper. Prepare yourself, my love, for casting out of the synagogue.'—Vol. ii. p. 44.

Another extract may be allowed, for obvious reasons:—

'The other day the new Bishop of Chester, Dr. Sumner, confirmed about two or three hundred persons. . . . It was to me very impressive, and I hope very profitable. . . . His brother, the Bishop of Winchester, bore him company, and I was much impressed with the episcopal authority and sanctity of their appearance. Indeed, the more I look into the Church of England, the more I recognise the marks of a true Apostolical Church, and desire to see somewhat of the same ecclesiastical dignity transferred to the office-bearers of our Church, which hath the same order of bishops, priests or presbyters, or elders, and deacons, whereof the last is clean gone, the second little better, and the first hath more of a worldly propriety, or literary and intellectual character, than of episcopal authority and grave wisdom. Oh, that the Lord would revive his work in our land! In what I have said, I do not affect the ceremony, or state, or wealth of the English Church, but desire to see some more of the true primitive and Scottish character of our Church restored. I would wish every parish minister to fulfil the bishop's office, every elder the priest's, and every deacon the deacon's; and I am convinced that till the same be attempted through faith in the ordinances, we shall not prosper in the government and the pastorship of our Churches.'—Vol. ii. p. 55.

The year closed with the second Albury Conference. Dr. Chalmers had by this time become Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh. To him in this capacity, and also as a much-loved and much-honoured friend, Irving wrote touching his desire to take the degree of D.D. No answer is recorded; and far other business had his beloved Scotland in preparation with regard to him than that of conferring upon him academical distinction. Shortly after this another letter to Chalmers appears, which, as collateral proof of his deepened views on Sacramental doctrine, may be copied in full:—

‘MY DEAR SIR,—This case has occurred to us as a Session on which it has been resolved to consult you, our ancient friend, and any other doctors or jurists of the Church with whom you may please, for the better and fuller knowledge of the matter, to consult. It is, whether the Church permit baptism by immersion or not. The standards seem not to declare a negative, but only to affirm that baptism by sprinkling is sufficient. In the Church of England, the rule of baptizing infants is by immersion, and the exception is by sprinkling. I sought counsel of our Presbytery in this matter which once occurred in an adult, as it has now occurred in an infant. They seemed to be of the mind that there was no rule, but only practice, against it, and advised upon the ground of expediency to refrain. . . . The father, who is a member of the Church, is a most pious and worthy man, full of forbearance to others, but very firmly, and from much reading, convinced of the duty of baptizing by immersion only. He has waited some time, and the sooner we could ascertain the judgment of the Church the better. . . . My own opinion is, that our standards leave it as a matter of forbearance, preserving the sprinkling—the Church of England the same, preserving immersion. I am sorry to trouble you who have so much to do, but the mere writing of the judgment would satisfy us. And as you are now the head of the theological faculty, as well as our ancient friend, the Session thought of no other, at whose request I write. . . .’—Vol. ii. p. 68. § 34

No answer to this remains, if one were ever sent, which is extremely improbable.

In the spring of 1829 the *Morning Watch*, a quarterly journal of prophecy, was started—being, in fact, the organ of the Albury School. Irving contributed largely to its pages. The subject of prophecy had become an all-absorbing pursuit with him. The immediate personal advent of our Saviour had grown into a fixed idea in his mind. The unremitting proclamation of what he deemed a vital truth was to him a duty, to the performance of which he felt himself urged by the most solemn necessity. It seized and held him with the strength of a monomania, and one cannot but feel an increasing sadness as one proceeds with his history, to remark how that grand intellect of his began to show signs of trembling and swaying from its proper balance under this too engrossing idea. One grieves to see that his mind has fastened upon the one thought which will work its ruin.

Another preaching visit to Scotland was planned and executed, with somewhat less of *éclat*, with considerably more of suspicion. While at Edinburgh he claimed, on the nomination of

the borough of Annan, to sit in the General Assembly as its representative elder. The claim was discussed and decided against him. During this visit he dined with the Royal Commissioner of the Assembly, and sat opposite Sir Walter Scott, who, in a letter referring to this occasion, says of him, 'he has genius on his brow, and madness in his eye,'—words in every respect true, and for the truth of which brilliant and mournful evidence abounds.

The concourse of people at his preachments was incredible, but not more incredible than the power of voice with which he addressed them. 'The surveyor at Annan,' he says in a letter, 'had the curiosity to measure the ground and estimate the people. He made it as many as 13,000, and there were more at Dumfries. My voice easily reached over them all;' to which Mrs. Oliphant adds in a note, 'It is recorded that when preaching at Monimail in Fife, in the open air, his sermon was heard distinctly by a lady seated at her own window a quarter of a mile off; and his voice was audible, though not distinctly, at double that distance.'

On his return to London, he published '*Church and State*,' a work in which he fell into the common error of handlers of prophecy, namely, of forcing a political meaning applicable to the particular time, out of eternal utterances which veil truths intended for the instruction of all times. A politician, in the common sense of the word, Irving was not. He was far too high, far too impracticable, to take interest in, or even to be patient with, the fluctuations of parties and policies. But in such matters as the abolition of the Corporation and Test Acts, and the repeal of Roman Catholic disabilities, by which he deemed the honour of the almost advent '*King*,' and the glory of the almost established '*Kingdom*,' to be set at naught, he was a politician of the most unmitigated ardour.

There is a curious and amusing anecdote, connecting him with his equally eccentric, though not equally gifted, friend Joseph Wolff. Wolff, with his wonted thoughtless good nature, sent two Cypriot Greeks to Irving, throwing them absolutely on his hands for provision in all things. He sent them to Robert Story of Rosneath for him to superintend their education in Scotland. He heralds their coming in a letter to Story, in which he describes them; and, with his usual catholicity, takes occasion to remark upon the institutions of the Greek Church. He says they are—

'The one a deacon (Parthenius), the other a youth of thirteen (Pavolo). The deacon is about twenty-four years old, and brings excellent testimonials from one of the bishops of Cyprus, upon whom he has been accustomed to wait; for the deacon in the Greek Church is nearer to the deacon in our Church, than

either in the Latin or English Church.'—*Memoir of the Rev. Robert Story, of Rosneath*, p. 248.

From a letter to his wife, describing the Albury Conference at the close of this year, we quote the following, as giving another glimpse of his sympathy with the Church of England:—

'This morning I have been alone, being minded to partake the Lord's Supper with the rest of the brethren. I find Mr. Don agrees with me in feeling his mind clear to this act of communicating with the Church of England.'—*Vol. ii. p. 100.*

Up to this point the reader of Irving's life feels like the seafarer, who has for long observed ahead threatening clouds gathering up from the horizon, although immediately around him the sea may be calm. But now the outskirts of the foreboded tempest are reached; the field of the storm is entered upon, and its fury, long feared, begins to be felt. Henceforward every step in Irving's course implicates him deeper in the theological strife which was to end in his defeat. Every circumstance, even those bearing but indirectly on his own case, helped to hasten him away from the sympathy, not only of his own communion, but also of every religious party then existing. The dispassionate observer of Irving's mind cannot but detect in it Catholic tendencies, quite opposed to any desire for personal isolation from his fellow-Christians, quite incompatible with the conceit of being himself the founder of a new sect. And yet it was to come to pass that men, seeking to describe the friends and followers of Irving, should be constrained to call them after his name, not because he was responsible for all they did and said, but because there was no other way of indicating their position. The 'Irvingites' are so called, not as being disciples of Irving, but rather as being his imitators. What he did as an individual, they have done as a body. He thought to enlarge the borders of his Christian fellowship by reaching back to ancient standards, and by embracing the earnest and true of other sects as brethren. He only succeeded in severing himself from his own Communion. In like manner the body, which calls itself the 'Catholic and Apostolic Church,' affects in its title the loftiest and widest sympathies; but the real fact is that its members stand alone, more distinctly cut off from intercourse with the rest of the religious world than perhaps is the case with any other community. The Irvingites are not the followers of Irving, in the sense that the Mohammedans are the followers of Mohammed. Irving is not their apostle or their prophet. But so far as they, being many, strive after what Irving, being one, strove after; and inasmuch as they do it with avowed reverence for his example, they are not improperly called Irvingites. They repudiate the title as an insult, and

Irving would have spurned it with indignation. But the world will persist in giving it them, and it will always have some show of reason for doing so. But this by the way.

In the year 1830 hostility to his views on the Human Nature of Christ began to take a more decided form. It was not, however, the master, but the disciples, against whom the first brunt of the storm was to break. Messrs. Scott and Maclean, who had been called, the one to a chapel at Woolwich, the other to a church in Scotland, both about the same time, held the same doctrine with Irving upon this great subject. When they came to their 'trials' their heterodoxy showed itself. The consequence was that lengthy inquiries and protracted prosecution of the question gave opportunity for men who had long looked on Irving with suspicion, if not with positive aversion, to deal him side-blows while aiming at his friends. Irving, as might be expected, did not shrink from the contest, but boldly stood forward, avowing his opinions with candid vehemence, sometimes with intemperate warmth. Indeed, he was no exception to the general rule of controversialists, at least of his own day, in the use of epithets. 'Schismatics,' 'doters,' 'fantastics,' are among the terms he applies to his opponents, and not sparingly.

Along with the excitement about this doctrinal question there arose another subject upon which, even more decisively, Irving was to split off from the Church of his fathers—the Church which he loved with all his heart, and which, for very love, he felt bound to reproach with all his vehemence, for departure from the truth of the standards.

"In the little farm-house of Fernicarry, at the head of the Gairloch, the saintly Isabella Campbell, whose name has been already mentioned, had lived and died a life of such unusual and expressive sanctity as to draw pilgrims to her couch, and to her home, from many quarters, and to confer upon her haunts a singular and touching local celebrity. The spot where this peasant girl—elevated by simple devotion and holiness into one of those tender virgin-saints whom nature, even under the severest Protestant restrictions, can scarcely choose but worship—was accustomed to pray, is still one of the shrines of the district. It was at one time a retirement of delicate simplicity—a lonely nook on the hill-side, close by the devious and picturesque channel of a tiny mountain stream. The burn still leaps in tiny waterfalls down its ledges of rock, undisturbed by that gentle memory; but some enthusiast pilgrim has built a wall, a memorial of rude homage, and affecting bad taste, round the mountain-ash and little knoll, which the girl-saint had made into a sanctuary. When Isabella died, a portion of her fame—her pilgrim visitors—her position as one of the most remarkable persons in the country side, a pious and tender oracle—descended to her sister Mary. This was the young woman "of a very fixed and constant spirit," as Irving describes, whom Mr. Scott, a few months before, had vainly attempted to convince, that the baptism with the Holy Ghost was distinct from the work of regeneration, but was as much to be looked and prayed for as the ordinary influences of the Spirit. Mary Campbell seems to have been possessed of gifts of mind and temperament scarcely inferior to

genius, and with all the personal fascination of beauty added to the singular position in which her sister's fame had left her, visited on terms of admiring friendship by people much superior to her in external rank, and doubtless influenced by the subtle arguments of one of the ablest men of the day, it is impossible to imagine a situation more dangerous to a young, fervid, and impressionable imagination.'—Vol. ii. p. 127.

A full and lucid account of the origin of these 'Tongues' is to be found in Mr. Story's memoir of his father, to which work also we refer the reader for much information that will throw useful light upon 'Spiritualism' generally—information which it would be well if people had more readily at hand, and knew how to turn to account, when called upon, as they were two years ago in the case of Revivalism, to form a judgment as to what is the work of the Spirit.

Irving, as might be supposed, listened eagerly to the reports of these extraordinary phenomena. His mind was always ready to wander, at the slightest invitation, into the region of the transcendental and mysterious. The marvellous ever had a fascination for him. And this natural disposition had received a special education in the Albury School of the prophets. That Christ's second coming was at hand was now an established article of his belief. That this advent should be preceded by a miraculous and general outpouring of the Holy Spirit, followed as of course. The consequence was that Irving received the strange rumours from the banks of the Gairloch, as voices of the Spirit, with the credulity of an expectant believer. Perhaps there is no better and shorter way of giving a notion of the attitude which Irving assumed towards the Kirk, both on this subject, and also on the doctrinal point, than by quoting the following from a letter of his to Doctor Chalmers, dated June 2d, 1830:—

'I perceive two things in Scotland of the most fearful omen. First, self-sufficient ignorance of theological truth, and a readiness to pride themselves in, and boast of it; and to call everything speculation which proposes to advance the bounds, or rather, narrow limits, of theological knowledge. My doctrine on our Lord's human nature is as literally the doctrine of the Confessions of the Church as can be—viz.: that He took the human nature of the Virgin, that it was thoroughly and completely sanctified in the generation by the work of the Holy Ghost, and underwent no process or progress of sanctification. Yet through ignorance of the person and office of the Holy Ghost, I perceive the greatest horror to prevail against this truth, and a readiness to adopt one or other of the errors—either that His nature was intrinsically better than ours, or that it underwent a physical change before its assumption into the person of the Son. If you would see, within a short compass, the three opinions brought to the test of the Confessions of Faith, I recommend to you a short anonymous tract, entitled, "The Opinions circulating concerning the Human Nature of our Lord brought to Trial before the Westminster Confession of Faith." You ought to give some study to this point, and stand in the breach for the truth. I have thoroughly gone through the subject of the Incarnation; and if it served you, *could at any time give you the history from the beginning of the controversies*

on this subject, and of its present form. The second thing which grieves and oppresses my heart with respect to poor Scotland, is the hardness of heart manifested in the levity and cruelty with which they speak of others; the zeal and readiness with which they rush to overthrow such men of God as John Campbell; the union of all parties to this end; the scorn with which they regard the signs of the Holy Ghost, beginning to be again vouchsafed to the Church; and, if not scorn, the mere juryman way of considering them, as the House of Commons might, without any respect to any existing promise or probability, or doctrine of any kind upon the subject,—also without any regard to the discernment of the Holy Ghost in us, and even as if the Holy Ghost were merely a sharpener of our natural faculties to detect imposture or to know sincere persons. The substance of Mary Campbell's and Margaret Macdonald's visions or revelations, given in their papers, carry to me a spiritual conviction and a spiritual reproof which I cannot express. Mr. Cunningham, of Lainshaw, said to me the other day, that he had seen nothing since the Apostles' days worthy to be compared with a letter of Mary Dunlop's which is written to a person in this city. Thomas Erskine and other persons express themselves more overpowered by the love, and assurance, and unity seen in their prayers and conversations than by their works. Oh, my friend! Oh, my dear master! there are works of the Spirit and communions of the Spirit which few of us ever dream of! Let us not resist them when we see them in another. Mind my words when I say—"The Evangelical party in the Church of Scotland will lay all flat, if they be not prevented."—Vol. ii. p. 138.

There is something amusing, and at the same time saddening, in the pertinacity with which he stigmatizes the Evangelical as a party in the Kirk, blindly holding to the conviction that the Kirk and he are at one. Alas! he was to find this 'party' a tyrant majority against him.

With the condemnation of Maclean and Scott for doctrine, and the 'Tongues' which were heard from Fernicarry, and the 'gifts of healing' which had shown themselves at Port Glasgow, we may consider that all things were put in order for bringing about the final act of Irving's life.

A visit to Ireland, full of labours, with other matters, many of a private nature, giving refreshing pauses from the contemplation of coming troubles, fill up the record of this year. A characteristic anecdote comes in here worth repeating:—

'The congregation at Regent Square, under Irving's inspiration, had decided upon presenting a petition to the king, calling upon him to appoint a national fast. . . . Accompanied by three of his elders, he went to Lord Melbourne, by appointment, to present this singular address. While they waited in the ante-room of the premier's house, Irving called upon his somewhat amazed and embarrassed companions to kneel, and pray for "favour in the sight of the king's minister," as a private letter describes it. When they were admitted to the jaunty presence of that cheerful functionary, the preacher read over to him at length the remarkable document he came to present; during the reading of which, we are told, "Lord Melbourne was much impressed; and also by some solemn things Mr. Mackenzie (one of the elders) said on the only means of saving this country." When they took leave, the minister shook hands heartily with Irving, who, holding that hand in his gigantic grasp, "implored the blessing and guidance of God on his administration."—Vol. ii. p. 165.

Hitherto we have followed Mrs. Oliphant with tolerable fidelity in the course of her narrative. But now we must step aside and leave her to go on her way through the dreary region, along which it henceforth lies, alone. We shall content ourselves with taking a comprehensive survey from a more distant stand-point. It is not that we feel wearied with our journey hitherto. Far from this. Mrs. Oliphant has carried us along with her with well-sustained interest. We have been anxious that our readers should share our pleasure, and if we pause at this point in leading them on from extract to extract any further, it is because we should have to handle the details of a subject which not long ago occupied much space in this Review, and which, from the excessive attention it demanded at the time, repels, rather than invites, contemplation. Revivalism has exhausted all curiosity, and the sad fact that, in a former period of its history, it should have been the immediate cause of desolating a noble heart and ruining a lofty intellect, and the still sadder fact that it should have given rise to a new sect, that it should have made one more rent in the 'seamless coat,' may kindle our sorrow, but can hardly reawaken our interest. We do not mean that we are utterly incurious as to the connexion which subsisted between Irving's severance from the Kirk and the 'Gift of Tongues'; between the so-called prophesyings and the 'Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.' But we must be excused from going over in detail the pitiful narrative of weak women and fanatical men breaking forth into incoherent mutterings, and Irving standing by, gravely moderating at these disorderly and profane exhibitions. Indeed, when we think of an hysterical girl rushing from the church to the vestry to give vent to meaningless utterances, and Irving 'begging for attention, and, when order was restored, explaining the occurrence, as not new, except in the congregation, where he had been for some time considering the propriety 'of introducing it'—when, say we, we reflect upon this scene, we can only exclaim, 'How are the mighty fallen!'

Notwithstanding the love and reverence which Irving always, and with truth, professed for the Kirk, it is a singular fact that the first step towards his separation from it was taken by himself. A member of the Presbytery of London brought forward a motion at one of the meetings indicting Irving's book upon Christ's Human Nature, and quoting passages from it as objectionable. Irving protested against this proceeding as contrary 'both to the Canon of the Lord and the order of the Presbytery.' He maintained that what affected his standing as an ordained minister of the Church of Scotland could only be decided by the Presbytery in Scotland. The Presbytery, on the contrary,

held him to be answerable wholly to their jurisdiction. From this position they would not descend; whereupon, to use his own words, 'I arose and went forth from them, appealing my cause to the Church of Scotland.'

Thus did Irving, by his own act, cut himself off from his beloved Mother Church, so far as the power of that Church could be brought to bear upon him. It is true that he thought far otherwise of his conduct. He thought he was merely setting aside the interference of an incompetent body, which would thrust itself between him and the only rightful object of his allegiance. He appealed to the Church of Scotland: for he only acknowledged the authority of the Presbytery in Scotland. He might just as well have appealed to the Holy Synod at Moscow, which had about as much power to make itself obeyed at Regent Square Chapel as the Church of Scotland had. If Irving had reflected at all upon the matter, he must have seen this to be the case. In a less ingenuous man one would suspect duplicity in his conduct. But the fact is, Irving was labouring under a tremendous delusion. He considered himself to be the most obedient and devoted son of the Kirk, while he was, in truth, the most unmanageable and insubordinate. Though he knew it not, yet all the elements of contumacy were centred in him. Nor had he been careful to conceal them. He had for long, in his preaching and in his writings, charged the Church of Scotland with being false to her principles and doctrines. He had declared himself to be almost the only orthodox minister of that Church. The absurdity of such a statement was obvious to every one but himself. It is a transparent artifice which has been resorted to by schismatics in all ages. But all schismatics have not been so completely and honestly blind as was Irving. To him it was no artifice, but a verity, an awful verity, over which he sorrowed with a real sorrow, and against which he fought with the intensest zeal. Throughout his ministerial life, nay, even before it had fully begun, while he was yet a 'probationer,' he never once seems to be contented with the Church of Scotland as it is. He grows impassioned and eloquent in his admiration of her; but it is always of her as she should be, as she once was, as he hoped she would once more become, but never as he himself had known her to be. Such repeated expressions of dissatisfaction with the Established Kirk, coming from one whose talents and genius held sway over the minds of the most intelligent of her members in the most intelligent of her outposts, would have irritated a much more impassible body than the Established Kirk at that time showed herself to be. Moreover, to this discontent with what she was, was added an undisguised satisfaction with many things in other

communions which she was not. Of the significance of Irving's far-casting liberalism with respect to himself we shall have to speak more at length by-and-bye. At present, we only note it as contributing to the ultimate schism. We need not be surprised, therefore, at reading that the Assembly, after it had finished (we had almost said 'polished off,' so unjust was the procedure throughout the trial, and so indecent the haste with which the condemnation was pronounced) the case of Mr. Campbell, of Row, 'on the occasion of a "Report upon Books" and Pamphlets containing Erroneous Opinions,' a motion was 'made that, if at any time the Rev. Edward Irving should claim the privileges of a licentiate or minister of the Church of Scotland, the Presbytery of the bounds should be enjoined to inquire whether he were the author of certain works, and to proceed thereafter as they should see fit.'

And this was the response which his dear Church of Scotland gave to Irving's indignant appeal from the London Presbytery. And what else could he expect? He, in the earnest vehemence of an utterly wrong-headed enthusiast, whose abilities, if they saved him from contempt, did anything but save him from suspicion and wrath, had said and done all he could to give force to his avowed dissatisfaction with his Mother Church. She had endured two of the most remarkable raids upon her territory in its most central parts from this man, who gathered thousands together to listen to his denunciations of a speedy judgment, not only against the world without her, but also against the unsoundness and unfaithfulness within her. He had done all this with single-mindedness, with pious devotion to the truth, with unfeigned love for the Church. But of this we are much better able to judge now, than the Kirk could possibly be then.

Irving, however, could not rest here. As if nothing might be wanting to complete his contumacy, he published a reprint of the 'Ancient Confessions of Faith' and 'Books of Discipline of the Church of Scotland.' His opinion of their value, compared with that of the later, and superseding, Westminster Confession, is stated thus by himself:—

'I prefer, beyond all measure, the labours of our Reformers, which took so many years to complete them; and grieve exceedingly that they should have been virtually supplanted and buried out of sight by the Act of one General Assembly in a factious time convened. . . . While I say I lament this other instance of Scottish haste, I am far from disavowing the Westminster Confession, to which I have set my hand, or even disallowing it as an excellent composition upon the whole. But for many reasons I greatly postpone it to our original standards. . . . The truth is, that the Church of Scotland was working with head and hand to proselytise or beat England into the Presbyterian form of Church government, and therefore adopted these books of the English Presbyterians, thinking there could be no unity without uniformity, a cruel

mistake which was woefully retaliated upon them in the reigns of the Second Charles and the Second James. It is not with any particular expressions or doctrines of the Westminster Confession that I find fault, but with the general structure of it. It is really an imposition upon a man's conscience to ask him to subscribe such a minute document; it is also a call upon his previous knowledge of ecclesiastical controversy which very few can honestly answer; and being digested on a systematic principle, it is rather an exact code of doctrine than the declaration of a person's faith in a personal God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I find it to be a great snare to tender consciences—a great trial to honest men—insomuch that, as a pastor, I have been often greatly perplexed to reconcile men, both elders and preachers, to the subscription of it. They seem to feel that it is rather an instrument for catching dishonest, than a rule for guiding honest people; that it presupposeth men knavish, and prepareth gyves upon their legs, and shackles for their hands. . . . In one word, there is a great deal too much of it for rightly serving the ends of a Confession. . . . There is no use for hard-fasting men at such a rate, although it be very necessary to exhibit a distinct standard of faith for them to rally under.'—Vol. ii. pp. 222, 223.

These words have a familiar sound in our ears. We have heard the like of them within our own Church, and in our own generation. It may be well for attention to be called to the fact, that the man who uttered them thought himself to be in all things most orthodox, while he left nothing undone to prove himself in every way at variance with his communion.

Thus, then, Irving stood in disunion from the London Presbytery, in disunion from the Assembly of Scotland, so far as that could be, seeing his position never owed much to his union with that body. And now there was nothing left to show that he had ever been a minister of the Established Kirk, save his connexion with his flock at Regent Square. And this connexion was soon to be severed. The 'Gift of Tongues' was to cut this last bond for him. Men who paid small heed to the London Presbytery, as being a body for whom their sole respect began and ended with the position which their beloved pastor held in it; men who cared not much for, because they knew not much of, and had never owned themselves amenable to, the Scottish Assembly; men, who heartily went with Irving, when he instituted the early morning prayer-meetings for the enlightenment of that Assembly (the supposed origin of the early daily service in the 'H. C. A. Church'), and as heartily went with him when he gave up the Assembly as hopelessly misguided and wilful,—these men were to be shaken in their adherence, and be obliged finally to abandon their favourite, by the frantic and unseemly doings which broke in upon the order of worship, interrupted even the flow of the splendid eloquence that had so long held them enchanted, and turned the chapel in Regent Square from being famous as the place where the greatest orator of his day discoursed, to being notorious as the scene of confusion and tumult. We are not surprised, though

Irving might have been, that men could not stand to listen to hysterical screams and senseless shoutings within the walls which had resounded to the melodious tones of his wonderful voice. We are not surprised that here they made a stand. They did it, however, with gentleness. They remonstrated, they pleaded, they reasoned, but all to no purpose. Irving's mind was clear upon the question. He had prayed for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the answer was these 'tongues,' these 'prophesyings.' Was he to reject the answer to his prayer? Nay, had not they themselves joined with him in those early supplications, day by day, for this outpouring? Of a truth they had, and yet they refused to recognise the answer when it was vouchsafed. Here Irving had them at a disadvantage. He was more consistent than they; he was more ostensibly logical than they. Their lame argument was, 'We prayed for the manifestation of the Spirit, and these unknown tongues have broken forth;' his more consequential reasoning was, 'We have prayed for the Spirit, and therefore these "tongues."' But they were right, and Irving was wrong. His commanding talent and influence had carried them along with him in seeking by prayer that the wonderful signs which had shown themselves on the banks of the Gairloch might be made to appear in their midst. We think there is that in Irving's hesitating and surprised manner which warrants the opinion, that he was somewhat perplexed and disappointed by the way in which the signs showed themselves. The reports from Scotland, when read as simple, ordinary narratives of events, could hardly prepare the reader for the discordant, disorderly, tumultuous outbursts which announced the arrival of the infection among the Regent Square people. The friends of Irving, many of them at least, had sufficient ballast of common sense to keep them right in this bewildering time. Despite the fact that they had prayed for the outpouring of the Spirit such as their brethren in Scotland had experienced, they would not accept behaviour, utterly destructive of all religious decorum and order, as an answer to their prayers. If Irving had had the choosing of the way in which the manifestations were to be made, doubtless he would have planned something much more stately and solemn. But he was far too thorough-going in his fervour, far too submissive to what he believed to be the designs of Providence, to reject what came to him with all the force of a response from heaven, merely because it offended, as it must have, all his high-strung sensibilities of the fit, and sacred, and orderly.

Here, then, was the point of divergence. Irving believed with a belief, which we cannot help calling abject credulity, in

the signs he saw, as heaven-sent. The trustees of the chapel disbelieved them, and were utterly opposed to them as being repugnant to the spirit of the Directory. They joined issue hereon. The advice of Sir Edward Sugden, 'That the trustees 'ought immediately to proceed to remove Mr. Irving from his 'pastoral charge by making complaint to the London Presbytery 'in the manner pointed out by the deed,' was acted upon.

We have no intention of traversing the counts of the indictment laid against Irving, or going through the protracted proceedings before the London Presbytery. The subject is handled fully, perhaps with excessive fulness, by Mrs. Oliphant. We confess we cannot agree with her in all her views of the conduct of the judges. Neither are we able to sympathize with her in her opinion of the behaviour of the trustees. Of course there is ample room for introducing an *argumentum ad misericordiam* into the statement of the kindly relations which had so long subsisted between the loving pastor and his attached elders, and of the attitude of opposition which these and the trustees felt bound to assume towards him. But the fact is, the blame of harshness unavoidably clings to any proceedings taken against a friend, notwithstanding the justness of their ground. If Irving and his elders had not acted together so amicably, Mrs. Oliphant would not have had ground for such pathetic appeals to the indignant pity of her readers. As regards the partiality, or impartiality, with which the proceedings were conducted, one or two points ought to be taken into account, which Mrs. Oliphant seems to have overlooked. In the first place, when any body of men is elevated to the importance of a judicial position, for which its members have not in any sense been educated, and which comes upon them as a rare event, drawing towards them the attention of the great outer world, it is but human nature that it should affect a fussy importance which is sure to damage the calmness necessary to equitable adjudication. Again, it is absurd to suppose it possible for such men as those who composed the London Presbytery, to keep clear in their minds the point at issue from the wholly irrelevant fact that the accused was under suspicion of a heresy not before the court. Edward Irving stood at their bar invested, in their eyes, with all the *odium theologicum* which spiteful rumour, and Mr. Cole's accusations, had gathered round him. It required far cooler heads, and better balanced minds, than these, or any other ministers, could be expected to possess, to think of the accused simply with regard to the counts of the indictment. Moreover, Irving had treated the London Presbytery with open contempt. He had utterly denied their competency to deal with him in any manner, and had haughtily withdrawn himself

from their meetings, and appealed his cause to the Scotch Assembly. Such insults were not likely to be forgotten when the Presbytery found itself sitting in judgment upon the man who had offered them. Doubtless there are many harsh sayings, many signs of petty tyranny, many betrayals of foregone conclusions, in the proceedings of this little court. But the members of the Presbytery must have been rare beings indeed if it had been otherwise. Not one of the conclave, probably, had ever played the judge before; certainly never with so illustrious a respondent before him. On the whole, when we compare the behaviour of the London Presbytery in Irving's case with the behaviour of the General Assembly in the case of Mr. Campbell of Row, we must own to our surprise that things were no worse. The precipitancy of the superior tribunal gives an air of deliberation and patience to the inferior court; and when we look at the wondrous length of Irving's defence, filling eighty closely printed octavo pages, we confess we think that, for a set of divines who had long before made up their minds upon the subject, they went through the business with something like decorum. As regards the decision, we cannot see how any doubt could exist. If the words of the 'Directory for the Public Worship of God' mean anything, they mean that such disorder as had broken up all decent worship at Regent Square Chapel should be put a stop to.

We leave this part of our subject gladly, and return to the personal history of the man, who, after all, was great and true. Banished from the chapel in Regent Square, Irving first betook himself to a room in Gray's Inn Road, where, at other times, Robert Owen propounded his infidel chimeras. He also preached in the open streets.

How thoroughly the belief in the restoration of the gifts of prophesying and of healing had got possession of his mind may be judged from a letter to the editor of the *Morning Watch*, in which he describes with wonderful simplicity and fervour his own experience of what he held as a truth, namely, that faith can overcome disease, inasmuch as disease itself is sin.

After some delay a fixed place for holding the meetings of what must now be looked upon as the new sect was found in the Picture Gallery in Newman Street, which once belonged to the painter West. Here it was that the body, self-styled 'The Catholic and Apostolic Church,' first appeared above ground as a separate communion; although, in point of fact, it had for some time been germinating in the bosom of the Scotch Kirk, calling itself after her name, though partaking little of her spirit.

That the Kirk could retain within her borders, even nominally,

so rebellious a son as Irving had turned out to be, was not to be expected. The Presbytery of Annan, acting under orders from the General Assembly, wrote to Irving, demanding whether he was the author of three tracts which they named. He replied with a bold avowal of their authorship, accompanied by an unsparing condemnation of the Assembly for having 'rejected God 'in all the threefold character of His revelation—in the love of 'the Father, the humanity of the Son, and the operations of the 'Holy Ghost.' If what had hitherto taken place left any doubt as to Irving's utter want of prudence, this answer would remove it. Early in the next year (1833) the Presbytery of Annan called Irving before its bar to answer the charge of holding the heretical doctrine of 'the sinfulness of our Lord's human nature.' Irving answered to the summons, and went to take his trial on the 12th of March. The details of this prosecution are in every way so painful, that we are glad to excuse ourselves from entering upon them on the ground of want of space. Nothing is lacking to the whole proceedings which can make them repulsive. The tribunal consisted of the presbyters of a country district in Scotland. We, in England, should think the clergy of any rural deanery a bench of sufficiently incompetent judges to try a brother priest upon a grave charge of heresy. And yet it would be difficult to find any deanery where the greater part, at least, of the clergy were not brought up as gentlemen, educated at one of the great universities, and moving in liberal and refined society. But what shall we say of the chances of justice, nay of theological truth, when we cross the Tweed and find the Presbytery, all-powerful for ecclesiastical weal or woe to the accused, to be made up of men, the most respectable of whom are the sons of farmers, all of whom have gone through the stiffening, contracting course of a Scotch theological education, and not a few of whom have lost the little good which that may have done them amidst the engrossing cares of the glebe and the homestead? We, in England, are prone to find fault with the cumbersome machinery of our ecclesiastical law. But when we look northward, and observe what process the Kirk has in its place, we ought to be thankful for our own law, even for its cumbersomeness. The worst that can happen with us is that, now and then, an offender against doctrine or discipline may slip through some loop-hole in the clumsy procedure; or that the somewhat too secular noblemen and gentlemen, who compose the ultimate court of appeal, may fail to detect heresy, where more expert theologians perceive it. But for the Scotch minister who is so unfortunate as to be 'libelled' before his Presbytery, it is not a question of how he may escape through some technical informality of a lengthy legal process, but rather

how he shall secure to himself a calm and dispassionate hearing. If the reader wishes for proofs in support of this, we refer him to Mrs. Oliphant's account of the trial of Edward Irving before the Presbytery of Annan (Vol. ii. pp. 340—350), and Mr. Story's account of the trial of Mr. Campbell of Row before the Presbytery of Dumbarton (*Memoir of Story of Rosneath*, pp. 152—166). We are not now speaking to the question, Were these gentlemen heretics or not? We are merely pointing to the fact that before such tribunals a charge of murder, of forgery, of any crime, as well as of heresy, would have small chance of being justly dealt with. The late Mr. Buckle said very few things about religion which were not either simply untrue, or grossly inaccurate; but one thing he did say which is pretty correct, namely, that Calvinism is more cordially entertained by the lower than by the higher grades of society. Scotland is a witness to this. Among the ministers of the Kirk there are scarcely any of the rank of a gentleman; and when one of those ministers indiscreetly betrays his impatience of the grim fetters of the Confession, the witnesses to his heterodoxy are dark-minded, hard-handed men from the plough and the market, among whose few ideas the one religious conviction is, that the damning part of their gloomy creed shall not have any of its rigour explained away.

Irving was 'cast out' by formal sentence of the Presbytery, pronounced in the church where he had been baptized and ordained. He turned his face homewards, lingering by the way to preach, with eloquence rendered more fervid by the heat of persecution, to thousands of hearers. When he reached London one of the most extraordinary facts in sectarian history took place:—

'Deposed by his Mother Church, he returned to Newman Street to the little community, which, according to ordinary ideas, he himself had originated and brought together, and of which he was supposed to be the ruling influence; and when he arrived there, with his wounded heart, he was received, not with extraordinary honours as a martyr, but with an immediate interdict, in "the power" forbidding him to exercise any priestly function, to administer sacraments, or to assume anything out of the province of a deacon, the lowest office in the newly-formed Church. . . . Such an inconceivable indignity, according to all human rules, did the spiritual authorities, whom his constant and steady faith had made masters of his flock, put upon their former leader. No expectation of any such setting aside seems to have been in Irving's mind when he subscribed himself their "faithful pastor and angel over Christ's flock." This, however, was the welcome he received when, sad and weary, he returned from Annan. As effectually as if the decree of the Scotch Church Court had bound that recalcitrant congregation, the deposed minister was silenced among them. I have no right to affirm that this was one among the many wounds that went to his heart, for not a syllable of complaint upon the subject ever came from Irving's lips. . . . Other men have founded sects to rule them; Irving, no founder of a sect, came forth through repeated anguish and conflict, at the

head of his community, only to serve and to obey."—Vol. ii. pp. 354, 355, *passim*.

After waiting for some time in silence, he was restored to be 'Angel' of the 'Church' in Newman Street, by the 'Apostolic' hands of Mr. Cardale, at the command of one of the ecstatic speakers. There are few scenes in the history of religion more touching than this of Irving meekly bowing his head to this re-ordination; few sights so sad as to see that noble, but alas! unbalanced, mind submit to be controlled by the broken ejaculatory commands of a few persons, all of whose importance was due to him, and whose very speeches betray how miserably inferior they are in intellectual stature to him who listens earnestly for their every word, and humbly obeys.

And now we come to the last chapter in Irving's life. The new sect, which had its head-quarters in Newman Street, but which began to spread in England and Scotland, absorbing now a nonconformist, now a Churchman, now a presbyterian, according as its strange fanaticism touched sympathetic minds, having established Irving in the office of 'Angel,' treated him therein, as in every way subservient to the dictates of the 'inspired.' He yielded an unquestioning obedience. Marvellous developments in ritual and discipline came out of their utterances, and to all these he bowed. To suppose him to be the leader in all matters is quite contrary to the fact. All the authority he had in the sect, all the responsibility with which he can be justly charged respecting it, begin and end with the time when he gave it out as his conviction that the 'tongues' were the utterances of the Holy Ghost. Since then he was an interpreter, a listener, a meek and faithful servant. The will, perhaps the wilfulness of others, made itself heard through these 'tongues,' and has left its mark upon the constitution of the sect; but from the time of his strange deposition on his return from Annan, the will of Irving was in absolute abeyance. He did the bidding of others; he gave no bidding himself.

And now a shadow had come over that brilliant mind, and feebleness began to show itself in those massive limbs. In sorrow and sickness henceforth, for the few days that are left him, he is to go about an emissary of others. He takes a journey to Edinburgh, on business for the sect. On his return, his health gives further signs of failing. He determines to go to Scotland, designing to combine a search for health with a sort of mission work. The account of this last journey we commend to the reader, as being one of the most moving and pathetic passages that was ever recorded in a biography. He travelled chiefly on horseback, taking a circuitous route through the west of England and Wales. From the different stages he writes to

his beloved wife, letters which, as they are set in Mrs. Oliphant's touching narrative, will move the reader almost to weeping. At last disease made itself master, in spite of his struggles against it. His wife joined him at Liverpool. With the strange restlessness of a dying man, he pushed on to Glasgow. Along with fluctuations of outward strength, the inward fever steadily consumed him. On the 8th of December, 1834, he died. The Hebrew of the 23d Psalm was among his last Scripture utterances, and his parting words were, 'If I die, I die unto the Lord. Amen!' He lies in the crypt of Glasgow Cathedral. He closed his life in his forty-second year, one of those septennial crises, when, as Jeremy Taylor tells us, 'it is odds but we shall finish the last scene.'

In order to get at the historical value of Irving's career, we must view it with reference to the Scotch Kirk, whence it took its devious way. Any one who has perused the standards of Scottish Presbyterian orthodoxy must have laid down the book with something like wonder, that the minds of intelligent men, and especially of Scotchmen, who are naturally prone to speculation, could be restrained with the very narrow, but very elaborate, fencing with which these formularies inclose the thought of the Presbyterian clergy. Of course, the majority of Presbyterians, as of any large body, is made up of men who passively adhere to the traditions in which they have been educated, and pay an unquestioning, though not a very enlightened, allegiance to their ancestral faith. But besides these there is an important minority who think for themselves, and who demand a reason for all they are called upon to do or believe. Now it is interesting to inquire how these leading minds adapt themselves to the cramped proportions, and withal infinite intricacies, of this most enthralling of creeds. The answer is twofold. Most intelligent ministers will accept the standards with reverence, and take pleasure in exercising their ingenuity, in expounding the wisdom and learning which underlie them (and we are far from denying that much of both is to be found in the close, hard logic of the Confession and the Catechisms), and will feel a real satisfaction in throwing the light of varied knowledge upon their dark solid mass. But, beyond these, there will be a small band of independent thinkers, following out lines of thought irrespective of the formularies by which they are bound; and it is no wonder if these thinkers soon overleap them. Thus, the intelligence of the ministry divides itself into two parts, the greater consisting of men who carry all their learning and talent to support the standards; the less made up of men who struggle to bring the standards into

conformity with the views which they have thought out for themselves.

It is clear that the real influence at work with the latter class is a secret dissatisfaction with the doctrines held to be orthodox. They may not own to it; they may not be aware of it: but if the times be free from political excitement and leave a clear field for their development, they will inevitably be brought face to face with the standards, and be called upon to reform their own teaching, or quit the communion. For such a development of thought, the internal and external condition of the Scotch Kirk was peculiarly favourable in the earlier part of this century. More learning, more talent, were thrown into its ranks, and there were no political questions to draw them off from theological speculation. Since 1834 matters have been different. The great subject of lay-patronage began then to agitate the Kirk, and culminated in its disruption in 1843. From that time to the present all the force and energy which have existed in the Established, or the 'Free,' Kirk have been spent in the most miserable and acrimonious quarrel. Lately a calmer state of things has begun to prevail, and soon, it is to be hoped, all bitterness and contention will have ceased. But, when this comes to pass, we venture to predict that signs of impatience under the fetters of the Confession will again show themselves, and cases of unquiet intellects breaking away from orthodox restraint will recur.

For a period of nine years, beginning about the year 1825, a state of doctrinal unrest heaved and troubled the bosom of the Scotch Kirk. One of the earliest and most remarkable cases was that of Mr. Campbell of Row, to which allusion has already been made. The Calvinistic dogma of Assurance was the point upon which he was charged and convicted of heresy. His unsoundness spread to the doctrine of the Atonement. With the Row case we must associate the name of Mr. Story of Rosneath. Although that excellent man had tact and prudence enough to avoid any direct charge of heresy himself, yet he incurred not a little coldness and suspicion by his bold and generous defence of his friend before the Dumbarton Presbytery and the Glasgow Synod. Nor was he the only advocate whom Campbell had among the ministers. In another part of the field of Presbyterian orthodoxy the names of Maclean and Scott appear. The latter gentleman finally burst through all doctrinal restraint whatsoever. Many other instances, less known, but not less significant, as indicative of the state of religious thought within the Kirk pale, might be adduced. But these serve our purpose, more especially as they are woven into the history of Irving's life. To all of these

men Irving stood as a sympathizing friend, and thus identified himself with the movement which stirred the intellect of his Mother Church. Consequently his true position in Scotch ecclesiastical history is, not that of a singular and exceptional schismatic, but of one mind amongst many—the most conspicuous, in truth, of the many—who strained and fretted against the bonds of the Westminster Confession.

It must, however, be borne in mind that it was a negative, rather than a positive, sympathy which subsisted between these restless minds. They were only agreed in being dissatisfied with the orthodox formularies; they were not agreed in being satisfied with anything in their stead. So it was, that while Irving exchanged expressions of fellow-feeling with his brother outcasts, he went forward in the new path, along which he felt himself so strangely and potently urged, without one of them to bear him company.

Of the general tendency of Irving's mind sufficient evidence has been given in the extracts we have made from his Life. We have now only to sum up the evidence, and direct our readers towards what, in our opinion, would be a proper verdict.

A certain perplexedness besets the theological character of Irving, in consequence of the monomaniacal ardour with which he took up and pursued prophetic research. This pursuit, which fills so large a space in the last decade of his life, as almost to shut out of view everything else, will be found, in fact, to run across, and not along with, the general bent of his mind. We shall, therefore, find it better to leave it out from our survey, estimating his tendencies, *minus* the prophetic element; and then to take into account the influence this element had upon those tendencies.

In both senses of the expression Irving was a man of a catholic mind. His sympathies were large; and he extended a kindly hand to all who got into doctrinal distress. To be seeking for more light, to be toiling under the yoke of an uncongenial sect, were sufficient claims to win Irving's help and pity, even though he might not be able to approve of the results of these struggles. But more remarkably than in this conventional sense of the term was he catholic-minded in the stricter theological acceptance. Perhaps it is hardly worth while to conjecture what he might have been, had he been differently circumstanced. Yet we cannot help thinking, as we read his biography, that if his life had fallen thirty years later, he might have found a sphere congenial to him in our own Church. As it was, he lived when the spirit of reverence was asleep amongst us. He died just when that spirit first showed

signs of waking. Had he been brought up within our pale, we are not sure that the unpliant system of the English Church would have been able to retain his erratic genius: we think that the more managing Communion of Rome would not soon have let slip his wondrous powers from her grasp. Irving was deeply reverential by nature. Whatever bore the stamp of antiquity commanded his respect. In the domain of Catholic theology he was ever reaching up through the Fathers, the Councils, the Creeds, to the most ancient form of truth; in the narrower field of his own Church he would not rest content with anything less than the 'Ancient Standards.' The spirit of reverence showed itself in his manner. He invested with solemnity, and even with a sort of form, the cold and meagre system of the Kirk. In all his ministrations there was a certain grandeur—'ower muckle grann'er'—for plain Scotch folk. His reading took the same direction. Hooker was a favourite, because Hooker was a reverential expounder of ancient faith. Overall's Convocation Book interested him, because it gave venerable reasons for venerable things. When the grave and decent institutions of the Church Catholic came before him he loved to dwell upon their apostolic origin or their internal fitness; he rejoiced exceedingly if he could detect any traces of them in his own communion. His interest in the deacon Parthenius is not a little strengthened by finding that 'the deacon in the Greek Church is nearer to the deacon in our Church than either in the 'Latin or English Church.' The appearance and functions of an Anglican bishop impress him; and he would gladly see somewhat of a restitution of the three orders in the Kirk. It is not to be expected that the Roman branch would draw from him so distinct an approval; but still there is something refreshing in hearing a Presbyterian minister speak calmly of 'the Latin Church,' and even hail cordially the Jesuit Lacunza as a voice from the Church of Rome. Nor did his Catholic yearnings stop at the externals. In doctrine a like tendency appears. We have adduced several quotations to show how high he went in his sacramental views. Upon baptism his language, as Mrs. Oliphant truly says, is scarcely, if at all, distinguishable from that of orthodox believers in Regeneration.

Here, then, we have hastily touched upon the lines of thought which issued from his mind, and have shown that they all pointed towards Catholicity—now in its eastern, now in its western quarter. But across them, as we have said, ran the vein of prophecy. The full extent to which it influenced Irving's mind we leave the reader to learn from his own works, and from our authoress' pages. It is only in our power to hint at it. To us it seems like a foreign element acting as a medium

through which all his rays of intellect passed, and by which they were bent aside and distorted, but not quenched. It predisposed him to accept as true the pretensions to inspiration which sprang up on the shores of the Gairloch. But, having accepted them, the force of his genius reacted upon them and produced that marked character in their ultimate development, which distinguishes them from the Revivalism of our own day. We have no hesitation in ascribing the outbursts at Fernicarry and the outbursts in Ulster, with their respective reproductions, to the same class of religious phenomena. But in their results the most complete contrast exists. The aim of recent Revivalism was to upset all belief in sacramental grace; to supersede catholic and apostolic means by irregular and frenzied methods of conversion. The final purpose of the 'Tongues,' and the 'prophesyings' of Irving's time, was to revive ancient institutions, to develop ritualistic observances, to elevate sacramental teaching. That this should have come to pass from the meaningless utterances of Mary Campbell we consider to be mainly, if not wholly, due to the influence of Irving. Recent Revivalism was a breeze of religious excitement which swept swiftly over the land, and left no trace of its ever having blown. The breath which first agitated the Gairloch was a similar breeze; but soon in its course it met with Irving. Irving caught it, and subdued it, and its permanent results are yet to be seen in the so-called 'Catholic and Apostolic Church.' This view may appear inconsistent with what we have said touching the humble and teachable attitude which Irving occupied in the new sect. But let it be remembered that, before the sect took shape, Irving had ample opportunity of giving a bent and purpose to the 'Tongues' and the 'prophesyings.' Afterwards he meekly waited upon the commands of the 'inspired;' but he was only receiving back in detail the results to which he had guided the first steps of the process. It does not follow from this that he wholly approved of those results. It does not appear that he did. But he acquiesced in them; and it is just this double relationship in which he stands to the sect, on the one hand, as its very earliest nurturer, on the other as its later and most obedient servant, which gives ground to the world for calling the sect 'Irvingites,' and gives ground to the 'Irvingites' for repudiating the title. In turning over the pages of 'The Liturgy' of the sect, even in its revised form, we see a reflex of Irving's mind. All his appreciation of the beautiful in worship, all his veneration for the ancient in ritual, all his width of sympathy for the good and true in every communion, are there. The 'note' appended to the Eucharistic office breathes his spirit.

'The Creed in the above office is set forth in the form used in the Churches in the West. The Churches in the East use the Creed in the form in which it was left by the Council of Constantinople. It does not follow that these two great divisions in the Christian Church are irreconcilably opposed on the doctrine involved in that clause, which the Western Churches affirm, and which the Eastern Churches abstain from affirming; and, until a competent authority shall pronounce thereon, it seems unreasonable that either form should be universally imposed.'

That 'Liturgy' is a sad study to a Churchman. It makes him sad to think what deep perceptions of Catholic truth were thrown away in Irving; it makes him sad to know how closely the spurious can imitate the genuine, and what appreciation of Catholic worship exists without the Catholic pale.

We may be expected to say something with regard to the heresy with which Irving was charged; with which the Presbyterians continue still bitterly to accuse him. We do not think it necessary that we should say anything; we do not think it useful that we should say much. As Churchmen, the doctrinal extravagances of a presbyterian have no vital import for us. At the same time, the point in dispute was so lofty, so grave, so all-embracing, that no Christian can think of it lightly. But when we come to deal with it, we find ourselves in a perplexity. Irving's accusers charged him with declaring that our blessed Lord's human nature was sinful. Irving indignantly denied the charge. It is easy to see how a man of little measure in language, of little moderation in temper, and of imperfect logical powers, as Irving undoubtedly was, might be driven into using expressions which sounded strange, harsh, even heretical, upon this solemn subject. That he did use such expressions we fully admit. Nevertheless, on a calm review of Irving's theological tendencies and general teaching, we confess we believe that his honest purpose was to bring out, in all its fulness, the scriptural truth, that our blessed Saviour was 'tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin;' that, saving the indiscretions of a too exuberant rhetoric, and apart from the irritating misrepresentations of the envious, his belief on this high subject does not go beyond that expressed in the following words of a living writer, whose allegiance to Catholic doctrines is unimpeachable:—

'We should not be truly of one Flesh and one Blood with Him, but that He took His Flesh and Blood from the loins of a Mother of the same race. Neither would it be the very same nature which had sinned, which was also redeemed, had He not received His humanity from one of the daughters of the fallen.'¹

With these remarks we dismiss this painful subject—painful,

¹ Sermons by T. T. Carter, p. 326.

because of the irreverent vehemence with which Irving's accusers pursued, and with which Irving himself was sometimes driven to treat it.

We close these volumes, repeating our thanks to Mrs. Oliphant. To save our character as critics, we may point out as a fault running through the book, an excessive clothing of words round facts, and somewhat of general diffuseness. Obscurity, too, occurs in places; *e.g.* in vol. i. p. 156, there is a passage which has baffled all our attempts to get at its meaning. But these defects do not abate the sincerity with which we congratulate the authoress of 'Margaret Maitland' upon having achieved for herself a permanent position in a yet more enduring branch of literature.

ART. IV.—*Aids to Faith; a Series of Theological Essays.* By SEVERAL WRITERS. Edited by WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: Murray.

OF the many treatises in defence of the generally received principles of Christian faith which the volume of 'Essays and Reviews' has called forth, no one, probably, so much engages the attention of thoughtful men at the present time as that which we have placed at the head of this article. Calm and moderate in its spirit, and at the same time earnestly and thoughtfully written, it well deserves the attention which it has obtained. The nine Essays, however, which it contains, are more or less independent, each treating of some one great element of revelation; and the writers have 'written independently, without any editorial interference, beyond a few hints to prevent omissions and repetitions, such as must arise when several writers work without concert.'¹ And hence the connexion between the several Essays is not immediately apparent to the general reader. We propose, therefore, in the present article, to give a more or less systematic and connected view of the truths which the volume presents as a whole. Such a view, it is hoped, will be a help to some who are already engaged in the study of these 'Aids to Faith.' And others may, perhaps, be led by a sketch of the leading features of the book to the study of a work from which they cannot rise without having obtained clearer and deeper and wider notions of the Christian faith and of the foundations upon which it rests. We have, indeed, in a former article, taken notice of the volume, as well as of the one which immediately preceded it. But we regarded it then more in the light suggested by the title of the other volume, namely, as a 'Reply to Essays and Reviews,' and we referred more especially to such passages in it as were designed to meet views put forward in that book. Regarded in that negative light, we consider, as we before stated, that the interest and value of the 'Aids to Faith' is but temporary. But we believe that they will have a lasting value for the positive statement of truths which they contain. And it is these truths of which we wish to give an outline systematically in the present article. We shall state them as far as possible in the words of the writers themselves, adding

¹ Preface by the Editor.

only such words of our own as may be necessary in order to place before the reader the connexion between the several parts of the system of dogmatic truth which we think may be extracted from these 'Aids to Faith.'

There are two ways in which the subject of revelation may be approached. Either the contents of the inspired record may be examined first, and then the nature and evidence of its inspiration may be considered afterwards; or the reverse order may be followed, and the general idea of inspiration may be considered first, and then the record claiming to be written under Divine inspiration may be examined afterwards. The first is the method naturally suggested by the order of the Essays in the 'Aids to Faith.' But the other is so far the more obvious and simple method, that we shall without hesitation adopt it here.

In this arrangement of the inquiry there will naturally be three points for consideration. *First*, What is the general idea of inspiration and an inspired record? *Second*, What are the evidences on which the conviction rests that the Bible, irrespective of its particular contents, is such an inspired record? *Third*, How far are the contents of the Bible, when examined, such as to allow of our accepting the volume containing them as written under the immediate inspiration of God? The answers to these three questions given in the volume before us we propose to exhibit as far as possible in a condensed form.

As to the *first* point, the nature of inspiration, the general question concerning it is thus stated at the beginning of his Essay on the subject by Canon Browne:—

'As in the natural world wisdom and intelligence are among the signs of life in an intelligent being, so in the spiritual world a spiritual understanding follows on the possession of spiritual life. As the Divine Spirit gives life, so He inspires wisdom. Indeed, all spiritual gifts flow equally from the same Spirit. St. Paul says that "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit," who gives to one the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another faith, to another miracles and gifts of healing, to another prophecy, to another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues." So he describes the influence of that one and the self-same Spirit on the early disciples in the Church of Corinth. Are we to take this literally? Are we to believe that, while some had spiritual wisdom and understanding—and that in larger or less degrees—others were enabled to work miracles, others to prophecy; that whilst to some there was only the common understanding of spiritual truths and mysteries, such as an enlightened mind among ourselves could penetrate, to others there was given an infallible knowledge of future events or of Divine truths otherwise unknown to man? Or, on the other hand, shall we think no more than this—that the Holy Spirit, who is the inspirer of all wisdom, by regenerating the heart, purifying the soul, exalting the affections, and quickening the intuitions of the mind, gives to some men more than to others an insight into things heavenly, and so enables them in all times and in all ages of the Church to be exponents of the Divine will?—that He reveals God and Christ to their inmost consciences, inspiring them with all high and holy

thoughts, and that thus they can utter things which would be deep mysteries to other men, and which are, indeed, the oracles of God?

This is pretty much the question concerning inspiration so much agitated now.—P. 287.

And the answer to the question, as well as the extent to which he conceives the Divine influence to have been exercised, is thus laid down by Dean Ellicott in a later Essay:—

‘If asked to define what we mean by the inspiration of Scripture, let us be bold, and make answer—that fully convinced as we are that the Scripture is the revelation through human media of the infinite mind of God to the finite mind of man, and recognising as we do both a human and a Divine element in the written Word, we verily believe that the Holy Ghost was so breathed into the mind of the writer, so illumined his spirit and pervaded his thoughts, that, while nothing that individualized him as man was taken away, everything that was necessary to enable him to declare Divine Truth in all its fulness was bestowed and superadded. And, as consonant with this, we further believe that this influence of the spirit, whether by illumination, suggestion, superintendence, or all combined, extended itself—*first*, to the enunciation of sentiments and doctrines, that so the will and counsels of God should not be a matter of doubt, but of certain knowledge; *secondly*, to statements, recitals, facts, that so the truth into which the writer was led should be known and recognised; *thirdly*, to the choice of expressions, modes of speech, and perhaps occasionally even of words (the individuality of the writer being conserved), that so the subject-matter of the revelation might be conveyed in the fittest and most appropriate language, and in the garb best calculated to set off its dignity and commend its truth.’—Pp. 411, 412.¹

How, in what manner, this Divine influence was exerted, it is beyond our power exactly to determine:—

‘It may be asked,’ writes Dean Ellicott, ‘how do we conceive that this inspiration took place? What is our theory of the process? what do we conceive to be the *modus agendi* of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man? These questions we justly refuse to answer. We know not, and do not

¹ The two opposite *points of view* from which the subject of the inspiration of the Bible may be approached, we have nowhere seen so simply stated as it is by the same writer in another place:—‘Thus far we are perfectly in accord with our opponents. We are agreed on both sides that there *is* such a thing as inspiration in reference to the Scriptures, and we are further agreed that the Scriptures themselves are the best sources of information on the subject. Here, however, all agreement completely ceases. When we invite our opponents to go with us to the Scriptures to discuss their statements on the subject before us, and to compare the inferences and deductions that either side may make from them, we at once find that by an appeal to Scripture we and our opponents mean something utterly and entirely different. We mean a consideration of what Scripture says about itself: we find that *they* mean a stock-taking of its errors and inaccuracies, of its antagonisms with science and its oppositions to history,—all which they tell us must first be estimated, and with all which, they urge, that inspiration, be it whatever it may, must be reconcileable and harmonized. In a word, both sides have started from the first on widely different assumptions. We assume that what Scripture says is trustworthy, and so conceive that it may be fittingly appealed to as a witness concerning its own characteristics; *they* assume that it abounds in errors and incongruities, and suggest that the number and nature of these ought to be generally ascertained before any further step can be taken, or any opinion safely arrived at on the whole subject. Such seems a fair estimate of the position and attitude of the two contending parties.’—P. 404.

presume to inquire into the manner; we recognise and believe in the fact. Individual writers may have speculated; imagery, suitable or unsuitable, may have been introduced as illustrative by a few thinkers in early ages; but the Catholic Church has never put forward a theory. On this subject she has always maintained a solemn reserve: she declares to us that in the Scripture the Holy Ghost speaks to us by the mouths of men; she permits us to recognise a Divine and a human element; but, in reference to the nature, extent, and special circumstances of the union, she warns us not to seek to be wise above what has been written, not to endanger our faith with speculations and conjectures about that which has not been revealed. Theories of inspiration are what scepticism is ever craving for: it is the voice of hapless unbelief that is ever loudest in its call for explanation of the manner of the assumed union of the Divine with the human, or of the proportions in which each element is to be admitted and recognised. Such explanations have not been vouchsafed, and it is as vain and unbecoming to demand them as it is to require a theory of the union of the Divinity and Humanity in the person of Christ, or an estimate of the proportions in which the two perfect natures are to be conceived to co-exist.—P. 413.

The general idea of inspiration having thus been laid down, the *second* question naturally arises, What proof is there that the Bible is thus inspired? or, in other words, On what grounds does the doctrine of the Inspiration of the Bible rest? The importance of such a question is well insisted upon in the Essay on the Evidences of Christianity, by the Bishop of Cork:—

‘Equally vain,’ he writes, ‘is the notion that we may safely disregard everything that seems not suitable to our moral nature. Here, again, let us have recourse to that analogy which the great master of that argument has justly described as “the very guide of life.” How ill would a child reason who should obstinately neglect every study, the use of which he could not himself discern! And, as to the things of another life, are we not all children? Shall we, who know not what an hour may bring forth—we, whose wisest calculations and most sagacious foresight are perpetually baffled and brought to nothing in a moment by the changes and chances of even this short mortal life—shall we presume to take our own case for eternity into our own hands, and determine for ourselves what is sufficient for us to believe? The Almighty has taken us under His own care. He has promised us an inheritance of which we know little more than that it is a state of eternal holiness and happiness. He has engaged to prepare us for it here; and, for that purpose, has revealed to us those truths which He saw fitting for our discipline. Can we know so certainly how the character which He requires is to be formed, as to be able to correct the method which He has been pleased to employ? Do we know our spiritual diseases so well that we can safely reject the remedies which the Great Physician has prescribed for them? Are we, in this our state of infancy, so perfectly acquainted with all that is needful for our manhood that we can manage our own education, and determine the training by which we are to be reared for heaven? If, indeed, the present life were the whole of each man’s existence, if our only immortality were the immortality of the human race, there might be some specious ground for saying that we had now made such a survey of all our narrow domain, and gained such a knowledge of our capacities and implements, that we were at last entitled to be our own masters, and might trust to our own little skill and prudence in the management of our own little territory. But if a boundless and untried existence, beyond the limits of all our experience, really does lie before each individual hereafter, it is surely mere madness to neglect, in matters which concern that

existence, the teachings of Him who alone knows the nature of that hidden world into which we are so blindly passing.

A prudent man, then, will not only inquire what it is that his heart seems to want, but also how far those wants are in point of fact supplied. He will not only consider what he wishes to be true, but what he has reasonable evidence for believing to be true. He will treat the truths of Religion as matters of fact, and seek for the appropriate evidence of matters of fact—that is, in other words, for historical evidence.—Pp. 61, 62.

What exactly are the grounds for our belief in the inspiration of the Bible; what are the *credentials* upon which rest the claims of a teacher to speak by the direct inspiration of God; and, more generally, what are the main outlines of that complicated structure on which rests our assurance that the words of Scripture are not the mere utterance of highly gifted and devout minds, but that ‘holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost’ (2 Pet. i. 21), is a point which we look for in the Essay in vain. But the omission has been in some measure supplied in another Essay by Dr. McCaul, who writes as follows, in words which recall to the reader the well-known passage on the same subject at the beginning of Bishop Pearson’s Exposition of the Creed¹:—

‘Without this supernatural call, and without this specific message, no one can, according to Scripture idiom, without great confusion of mind, or wilful and dishonest abuse of language, be said to possess anything like prophetic inspiration. The Apostles of the New Testament, called directly by the Lord Jesus Christ, moved by His Holy Spirit, and intrusted with a specific message, were and may be called prophets in the true sense of the word, for they were able to affirm that the Gospel proclaimed of them was “not of man, but by revelation of Jesus Christ;” and they communicated it “not in words, which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” But to speak of poets ancient or modern, or philosophers, or lawgivers, as being inspired, like Moses or Isaiah, is simply to confound things Divine and human, and to manifest great mistiness of apprehension, or daring profanity of spirit. It is just as contrary to Scriptural statement, and as revolting to Christian reverence, as to identify the prophetic character and calling with that of the demagogues of Greece. Poets and philosophers exercise the high natural gifts bestowed by God, according to the movings of their will or the impulse of their genius; apply, and sometimes abuse them, according to the state of their hearts; but do not pretend to any external call from God, nor claim for their words the reverence due to the word of the Almighty. The Hebrew prophets announced themselves as God’s messengers, claimed obedience and reverence for their message as the word of God, and therefore carried with them credentials for the satisfaction of the people. These credentials were, according to the Hebrew Scriptures, *miracle* and *prediction*. To accredit Moses as His messenger to the children of Israel, He empowered him to make three super-human manifestations of power, saying, “If they will not believe thee, neither hearken to the voice of the first sign, that they will believe the voice of the latter sign.” And therefore the prophet like unto Moses, also appealed to His works as greater testimony than that of John the Baptist, and says, “If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin, but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father.”—Pp. 88, 89.

¹ Pp. 11—17, Oxford Ed. 1847.

If, then, these are the great credentials of an inspired teacher, the next question which arises is, Did those who profess to be inspired teachers exhibit undoubtedly these powers *as a fact*? And this point, that Christianity is to be regarded, not as an abstract theory, but as an *historic fact*, and to be examined as such, with the practical consequences involved in this, is so admirably pointed out in his Essay on the Evidences of Christianity by the Bishop of Cork, that we shall venture to quote his words at length:—

‘A religion disentangled entirely from all historical inquiries, and commending itself immediately to the mind by its mere intrinsic beauty and suitability to man’s wants and wishes, may be a very captivating vision, and seems highly desirable on many accounts; but it is a gross abuse of words to call such a religion Christianity. Christianity is the religion which was taught by Christ and his Apostles; and it was certainly an historical religion—a religion made up of matters of fact, and propounded on the evidence of matters of fact—which they promulgated. “That which we have heard and seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life, declare we unto you,” is the language of the first preachers of the Gospel; and the modern attempt to separate the ideal Christ, the type of the godlike in man, from the historical person, is not a whit less opposed to the genius of the Apostolic religion than was that teaching of the Gnostics against which the last of the Apostles raised his warning voice as the very spirit of Antichrist. The Christ of the Gnostics was an impalpable *Æon*; the Christ of their successors is something less substantial—an abstract idea.

It may indeed, on the surface, seem strange that the Christian religion should be thus incumbered, as it were, by an apparatus of history; and that men should be required to investigate the evidence of past transactions in order to find a basis for their Faith, instead of merely consulting their hearts, and finding an *echo* there, to attest the divinity of its voice. But in this, as in other cases, we shall find, upon reflection, that what seems the foolishness of God, is wiser than men. The careful and candid investigation of the evidences on which Christianity rests—not for the satisfying a mere inquisitive curiosity, but to find truth for the regulation of our lives—is an eminently practical exercise of the understanding, and brings home the great facts of our religion *as facts* to the mind, with a feeling of their reality which the most highly raised efforts of the imagination cannot give them; and thus makes rational deliberate faith a counterpoise to the engrossing influence of sense. In the affairs of the world, we know that realities address themselves, in some shape or other, to the judgment; and that those that exclusively and immediately address the feelings and the imagination are unreal. If then the objects of religion entered only through this ivory gate of fancy into the mind, a steady practical faith in their reality could be hardly maintained. I say a *steady practical* faith; for, undoubtedly, if religion were a mere affair of feeling divorced from practice, or of practice divorced from motive and reduced to the mere mechanism of custom, there might be something intelligible in discarding all investigation of evidence. Every one, even superficially acquainted with the structure of the human mind, is aware that the feelings may, as in the case of a novel or a play, be deeply interested and strongly excited, without anything but, at best, a sort of dim and transient belief in the reality of the objects which thus interest and excite them; and that, for such a purpose, scarcely anything more is necessary than that the mind should not, for the time, *attend* to their unreality. This suffices for mere feeling: but for action, a perfectly *sane* man requires more. He requires evidence as a ground of

belief: and, even in an insane man—where the fancy has become paramount, and established its throne upon the ruins of the understanding, close observers can generally detect a lurking suspicion of the deceitfulness of the mind's own visions—an unsteady wavering flicker in the predominating persuasion, which betrays a difference of no small importance between rational and irrational belief; a secret sense of insecurity and weakness, which makes the mind of the madman, except in some high paroxysm of frenzy, succumb and quail before the calmer presence of a well-regulated intellect.

There is another use also served by this complication of religion with historical inquiry, which it is not unsuitable to notice. The essential connexion of Christianity with the history of past ages makes a provision for the maintenance and advancement of civilization in every country in which Christianity prevails. It was this which made the preservation of learning possible when the great flood of barbarism swept over Europe, and the Church alone contained the sacred deposit of an earlier civilization—the memory of the past, and the hopes of the future. And it is this which is still a bulwark against barbarism. Barbarism is essentially that state of mind which is produced by placing it exclusively under the influences of a contracted *present* sphere of circumstances. It is, as Dr. Johnson justly said, “by making the past, the distant, and the future predominate over the present,” that we are “advanced in the dignity of thinking beings.” All history, more or less, renders this valuable service to the human mind; but it cannot be reasonably doubted that the history of the Church, in that view of it which the Bible presents, as one continuous body from the beginning of the world, is, of all others, the best fitted to render such a service. The idea of history, it has been truly said, is that of the biography of a *society*. There must be, to constitute the narrative properly historical, an unity of action, interest, and purpose among the persons who are the subjects of it. Now, whether we consider the length of its duration, or the breadth of its extent—the variety of its fortunes, or the unity of its purpose—the diversity of its members in age, and character, and language, and manners, and habits of thought, and stages of cultivation, or the closeness of mutual relation into which all these seemingly scattered persons have been brought—what other society can anywhere be pointed out which can form so noble and so useful a subject for the historian? It is the conception of the Church which enables the mind not only to combine, but to blend together, the pastoral simplicity of the primitive times of mankind and the elaborate civilization of later ages; to bring into one collection all the characteristics of all the climes and regions of the world—to bring all specimens of the human family, “from the north and from the south, and from the east and from the west,” and make them “sit down” before us “in the kingdom of God.” Nor can I doubt that the peculiar strength, and freedom, and versatility of the modern European intellect are, to a great extent, due to the historical character of Christianity. No one can read, intelligently, so much as the prime documents of our faith, even in a vernacular translation, without feeling himself transported into a region where the modes of conception and of expression, the events and the institutions to be met with, are strikingly different from those which surround him with the associations of everyday life; without, in short, finding himself, for the time, emancipated from the mere influence of the present, and brought under that of the distant and the past. Nor could anything have secured such a potent and salutary influence to history over the human mind as the indissoluble tie by which it is connected with religion; the feeling that, in our nearest and most intimate relations, we are personally connected, as members of one body, with the remotest past and the illimitable future—linked in one unbroken living chain, with patriarchs and prophets, and apostles and martyrs—heirs with them of the same promise, and waiting with them for the same completion of

the great mystery of God. And it is worth observing that Providence has so arranged matters, that the Eastern world—to which the language and habits of thought contained in Scripture were most familiar—seems destined to receive back its lessons, modified by the peculiarities of Western civilization and European teaching. In those nations where the language of Christianity was, as it were, a *native* voice, it produced least influence at first as a source of permanent civilization. It was the leaven of *foreign* associations which caused a fermentation in the Western mind; and, from the blended mass which was the product of that fermentation, it seems destined to pass back to the realms from which it came, in a form fitted to produce there a similar effect.

In the same degree, then, as any system has a tendency to break the connexion between history and religion, in that same degree it tends to deprive civilization itself of one of its chief safeguards—to withdraw from effective operation one of the most powerful causes which now stimulate research and bring the minds of the present generation into contact with those of the past. If the mind be referred immediately, for religious guidance, not to an historical document, but to a supposed infallible authority of the present Church, or to the supposed infallible authority of each man's fancy and feelings, the influences favourable to barbarism are so far restored: and I think the visible results of both experiments, so far as either has been consistently worked out, are such as to show that a retrogression towards barbarism would be their most probable consequence. To look only at the present—to live in the present—shape our habits by the present—adopt, at every change, the vogue of the day—and cast aside whatever we cannot accommodate to the taste of our own generation—this is to do our utmost to restore barbarity, and sink us below the level on which God and nature intended us to be placed. And hence we may find fresh reason for admiring the wisdom of the Divine economy which, in the case of the Jewish and of the Christian Church alike, withdrew, after a while, the living voice of inspired guides, and substituted for them, as the ultimate basis of faith, a written historical record of their teaching; thus building the Church, as a continuous body through all ages, on that foundation of the apostles and prophets, of which Jesus Christ Himself is the chief corner-stone.—Pp. 63—67.

And the general result of the examination of Christianity according to this method is thus summed up:—

‘The case stands thus:—The origin of the Christian religion is not one of those events so distant as to be lost in a fabulous antiquity. Whatever gave rise to it occurred at a period of which we know a great deal, in a civilized world, and within historic times; and was something which enabled the first preachers to make more *converts* among *enemies* in five years, than our most active missionaries have made in five centuries. Within no long time after the death of Jesus we find Christian Churches diffused in the most distant places over the civilized world, continually growing in numbers and importance, under the eyes and in spite of the hostility of their powerful neighbours. The consentient tradition of all these Churches ascribes their foundation to the first Disciples of Jesus Christ, and ascribes to those Disciples the Gospel that He had been raised from the dead, and that this Resurrection, with its preceding and accompanying miracles, was the ground of their faith. Their creeds, their sacraments, their universal observance of Easter and the weekly Lord's day, all embody this tradition. These Churches are not without written historical records. They put forward, with one consent, a body of documents, giving a detailed account of Christ's life, and death, and resurrection, and of the first preaching and fortunes of his Apostles, and embracing a collection of letters from some of those Apostles themselves. With respect to many of these writings, no literary man of any character, at present, doubts their genuineness.

With respect to most of the rest, it is at any rate agreed that they are not mere forgeries of a late age, but books written in good faith, at a date when the true history of the times they refer to was easily to be obtained. The testimony of these documents is the same as the tradition of the Churches. They put the Christian religion upon the evidence of miraculous facts, and specially of Christ's Resurrection, as attested by the alleged witnesses of it, in the very place where He had been executed as a malefactor, and in the face of the very persons by whom He had been condemned and slain.

What we are called upon to believe is—that all the Churches were mistaken as to the grounds of their own faith; that all the documents, and the Apostles themselves, have given a wrong account of it; that the belief in the religion was not grounded on the belief in the miracles, but that the belief in the miracles was grounded on the belief in the religion; that Jesus, who (if He wrought no miracles and was the subject of no miracles) contradicted, in every circumstance of his birth, and education, and teaching, and life, and death, the best established and most cherished notions of all around Him concerning the promised Messiah, was believed, in spite of all, to be that Messiah; that miracles were ascribed to Him because the Messiah *ought* to have wrought miracles; that He was believed to have risen again because it suddenly occurred to somebody that He *ought* to have risen again; and that, by such an easy and intelligible process as this, a creed of fables was transmuted into a creed of facts, and stamped indelibly, and with one impression, upon the faith and institutions of the great Christian communities throughout the world.

This is, in plain words, the theory of the origin of Christianity corrected to the latest results of Continental criticism; and it seems to amount to this—that CHRISTIANITY HAD NO ORIGIN AT ALL. It is, indeed, not criticism that has spontaneously yielded these results; but it is the *à priori* prejudice against miracles which has forced criticism upon this strange enterprise.'—Pp. 71, 72.

Such, then, is the nature of inspiration, and such are the evidences of the inspiration of the Bible, as exhibited in the volume before us. The inquiry now passes into its *third* stage. Are the contents of the Bible such as to allow of our believing it to be the genuine work of inspired writers? The chief difficulties which have been raised in reference to this may be summed up under three heads. First, it is urged, *generally*, that the Bible throughout introduces miraculous agency, such as is contrary to human experience, and which therefore cannot be believed. Second, difficulties are raised with respect to *large portions* of the Bible, as the Pentateuch. And, thirdly, exceptions are taken to certain *specific points* in the record, as, *e.g.*, to the Narrative of the Creation, or the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ, as contrary either to the results of scientific inquiry, or to the natural moral convictions of mankind. Each of these points is examined in the 'Aids to Faith.' The alleged errors of fact and contradictions in the Bible, which are also represented as proving that it is not an inspired, or at least, not an infallibly inspired, record, are not considered by themselves in the volume, but are many of them incidentally discussed.

The *first* point, the introduction of miraculous agency in the Bible, has, very wisely, been assigned to Professor Mansel. At the outset, he lays down the point of view from which he is

about to regard miracles (however the title of his Essay would have led us to expect the contrary), not so much as they are evidences of Christianity and of the inspiration of the Divine Record, but as they are matters of fact introduced into that record itself:—

‘What is the exact position of miracles among the evidences of Christianity, is a question which may be differently answered by different believers, without prejudice to their common belief. It has pleased the Divine Author of the Christian religion to fortify His revelation with evidences of various kinds, appealing with different degrees of force to different minds, and even to the same mind at different times. The grounds of belief consisting, not in a single demonstration, but in an accumulation of many probabilities, there is room, in the evidences as in the doctrines of Christianity, for special adaptations of different portions to different minds; nor can such adaptation be regarded as matter of regret or censure, so long as the personal preference of certain portions does not involve the rejection of the remainder.

The question, however, assumes a very different character when it relates, not to the comparative importance of miracles as evidences, but to their reality as facts, and as facts of a supernatural kind. For if this is denied, the denial does not merely remove one of the supports of a faith which may yet rest securely on other grounds. On the contrary, the whole system of Christian belief with its evidences, the moral no less than the intellectual influences, the precept and example for the future no less than the history of the past—all Christianity in short, so far as it has any title to that name, so far as it has any special relation to the person or the teaching of Christ, is overthrown at the same time.’—P. 3.¹

¹ The position of miracles in a system of *evidence* is given by Mr. Mansel in a later part of his Essay:—‘And it is at this stage of the inquiry that the question concerning the evidential value of miracles properly comes in. A teacher who proclaims himself to be specially sent by God, and whose teaching is to be received on the authority of that mission, must, from the nature of the case, establish his claim by proofs of another kind than those which merely evince his human wisdom or goodness. A superhuman authority needs to be substantiated by superhuman evidence; and what is superhuman is miraculous. It is not the truth of the doctrines, but the authority of the teacher, that miracles are employed to prove; and the authority being established, the truth of the doctrine follows from it. In this manner our Lord appeals to His miracles as evidences of His mission: “The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me.” It is easy to say that we might have known Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, had He manifested Himself merely as a moral teacher, without the witness of miracles. It is easy to say this, because it is impossible to prove it. We cannot reverse the facts of history: we cannot make the earthly life of Christ other than it was. As a matter of fact, He did unite miraculous powers with pure and holy doctrine; and, as a matter of fact, He did appeal to His miracles in proof of His divine authority. The miracles are a part of the portrait of Christ: they are part of that influence which has made the history of the Christian Church what it is. It is idle to speculate on what that history might have been, had that influence been different. We have to do with revelation as we have to do with nature,—as God has been pleased to make it, not as He might have made it, had His wisdom been as ours.’—P. 35.

And he adds the words of Bishop Butler:—“It may possibly be disputed how far miracles can prove natural religion; and notable objections may be urged against this proof of it, considered as a matter of speculation; but, considered as a practical thing, there can be none. For suppose a person to teach natural religion to a nation who had lived in total ignorance or forgetfulness of it; and

And the vast importance of the inquiry respecting the possibility of miracles, from their being so essentially interwoven with the whole system of revealed truth that the question of the possibility of them cannot in any way be regarded as one 'which merely affects the *external accessories* of Christianity, leaving the *essential doctrines* untouched,' is excellently stated in the following remarks:—

'It is necessary to state the case in this manner, in order to point out the real importance of the interests at stake. Nothing can be more erroneous than the view sometimes taken, which represents the question of the possibility of miracles as one which merely affects the *external accessories* of Christianity, leaving the *essential doctrines* untouched. Such might possibly be the case, were the argument merely confined to an inquiry into the evidence in behalf of some one miracle as an isolated fact, without impeaching the possibility of miracles in general. But such is not the question which has been raised, or can be raised, as regards the relation of miracles to the alleged discoveries of modern science. If the possibility of miracles be granted, the question, whether any particular miracle did or did not take place, is a question, not of science, but of testimony. The scientific question relates to the possibility of supernatural occurrences *at all*; and if this be once decided in the negative, Christianity as a religion must necessarily be denied along with it. Some moral precepts may indeed remain, which may or may not have been first enunciated by Christ, but which in themselves have no essential connexion with one person more than with another; but all belief in Christ as the great Example, as the Teacher sent from God, as the crucified and risen Saviour, is gone, never to return. The perfect sinlessness of His life and conduct can no longer be held before us as our type and pattern, if the works which He professed to perform by Divine power were either not performed at all or were performed by human science and skill. No mystery impenetrable by human reason, no doctrine incapable of natural proof, can be believed on His authority; for if He professed to work miracles, and wrought them not, what warrant have we for the trustworthiness of other parts of His teaching? The benefits obtained by His Cross and Passion, the promises conveyed by His Resurrection, are no longer the objects of Christian faith and hope; for if miracles are impossible, He died as other men die, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption. The prayers which we offer to Him who ascended into heaven, and there liveth to make intercession for us, are a delusion and a mockery, if miracles are impossible; for then is Christ not ascended into heaven.

In point of fact, even single miracles cannot be treated as isolated occurrences, and judged as we should judge of any similar fact narrated at another time. There is a latent fallacy in the appeal which is sometimes made to the manner in which well-informed men deal with alleged marvels at the present day. The Christian miracles can only be judged in connexion with the scheme of which they form a part, and by the light of all the collateral

'to declare he was commissioned by God to do so; suppose him, in proof of his commission, to foretell things future, which no human foresight could have guessed at; to divide the sea with a word; feed great multitudes with bread from heaven; cure all manner of diseases; and raise the dead, even himself, to life; would not this give additional credibility to his teaching—a credibility beyond what that of a common man would have; and be an authoritative publication of the law of nature, *i.e.* a new proof of it? It would be a practical one, of the strongest kind, perhaps, which human creatures are capable of having given them.'"

evidence which that scheme is able to furnish. The true question is, not what should we think of, or how should we endeavour to explain, a single marvellous occurrence, or even a series of such occurrences, reported as taking place at the present time? but, what should we think of one who should come now, as Christ came, supported by all the evidences which combined to bear witness to Him? If the world, with all its advance in physical science, were morally and religiously in the same state as at the time of Christ's coming; if we, like the Jews of old, had been taught by a long series of prophecies to expect a Redeemer in whom all the families of the earth should be blessed; if the events of our national history tended to show that the time was come to which those prophecies pointed as the epoch of their fulfilment; if we were in possession of a religion, itself claiming a divine origin, yet in all its institutions bearing witness to something yet to come—a religion of type, and ceremony, and sacrifice, pointing to a further purpose and a spiritual significance beyond themselves; if one were to appear, proclaiming himself to be the promised Redeemer, appealing to our sacred writings as testifying of himself, doing works, not only full of power but of goodness, full of wonder, but also full of love, and confirmed by Scriptures expressly declaring that such works should be done by him that was to come; doing them, not in secret, nor in an appointed place, nor with instruments prepared for the purpose, but openly and without effort, and upon occasions as they naturally presented themselves, in the street and in the market-place, in the wilderness and on the sea, by the sick man's bed and the dead man's bier; and expressly declaring that he did them by the power of God and in proof that God did send him—with all these circumstances combined, let any unprejudiced man among ourselves say which would be the more reasonable view to be taken of such works performed by such a person; whether to admit his own account of them, guaranteed by all the weight of his character, or to refer them to some natural cause, which will at some future time receive its explanation by the advance of discovery. Surely those who, even in this enlightened age, chose to adopt the latter hypothesis, rather than admit the teacher's own testimony concerning himself, would be the legitimate successors of those who, under like circumstances, declared, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils." —Pp. 5—7.

The exact question respecting miracles is then laid down:—

"It is not the rarity of miracles—no one asserts them to be common: it is not their general improbability—no one asserts them to be generally probable: it is not that they need an extraordinary testimony as compared with other events—such a testimony we assert that they have. It is neither more nor less than their *impossibility*—an impossibility to be established on scientific grounds, such as no reasonable man would reject in any other case; grounds such as those on which we believe that the earth goes round the sun, or that chemical elements combine in definite proportions. In this point of view the argument is altogether of a general character, and is unaffected by any peculiarities of probability or testimony which may distinguish one miraculous narrative from another. If the progress of physical or metaphysical science has shown beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt that miracles are *impossible*—if, as seems to be the tendency of a recent argument, the assertion of a miracle is now known to be as absurd as the assertion that two and two make five—it is idle to attempt a comparison between greater or less degrees of probability or testimony. The preceding observations will in that case only serve to show what it is that we have to surrender, and to rescue the inquiry from the particular fallacy which seeks to underrate its importance by representing it as only affecting the accidents and excrescences of Christianity. Let us, at the outset, be clearly convinced of the vital importance of the question,

in order that we may enter on its examination prepared, if necessary, to sacrifice our most valued convictions at the demand of truth, but, at the same time, so convinced of their value as to be jealous of sacrificing them to anything but truth.'—Pp. 11, 12.

And the antecedent probability that so special a work as the restoration of a fallen world should be conducted on a plan and involve the introduction of agency different from that employed in the ordinary course of the world is thus clearly pointed out:—

'The inquiry concerning the possibility of miracles in general (as distinguished from that which concerns the credibility of the Scripture miracles in particular) involves two distinct questions, which must be considered separately from each other. The first of these questions relates to the position occupied by miracles with reference to experience and to the empirical laws of matter; the second relates to their position with reference to philosophical conceptions of God's nature and attributes. It is indispensable to a clear understanding of the subject that these two questions should be kept apart from each other; though it will be necessary, in discussing the first, to take for granted some conclusions which will afterwards have to be established in connexion with the second. Let us then assume, for the present, that we are justified in conceiving God as a Person, and in speaking of His nature and operations in the language which we should employ in describing the analogous qualities and action of men. We shall speak, as theists in general are accustomed to speak, of the *will*, and the *purpose*, and the *design* of God; of the contrast between His *general* and *special* providence; of his *government* of the world and *control* over its laws; reserving for a subsequent inquiry the vindication of these and similar expressions from a philosophical point of view.'—Pp. 12, 13.

The whole argument of Mr. Mansel, by which the possibility of miracles is maintained, first, with reference to experience, and second, with reference to the nature and attributes of God, should be studied in itself. We will only give here the conclusion at which he arrives with respect to the supposed opposition between the belief in the miraculous interference of God at times and the uniformity observable in the course of the outward world:—

'So far then as a miracle is regarded as the operation of a special cause, producing a special effect, it offers no antagonism to that general uniformity of nature, according to which the same effects will always follow from the same causes. The opposition between science and miracle, if any exist, must be sought in another quarter; namely, in the assumption (provided that such an assumption is warranted by science) that the introduction of a special cause is itself incredible. The ground of such an assumption appears to lie in the hypothesis that the existing forces of nature are so mutually related to each other that no new power can be introduced without either disturbing the whole equilibrium of the universe, or involving a series of miracles, coextensive with the universe, to counteract such disturbance. This seems to be the meaning of the following observation by a recent writer:—"In an age of physical research like the present, all highly cultivated minds and duly advanced intellects have imbibed, more or less, the lessons of the inductive philosophy, and have at least in some measure learned to appreciate the grand foundation conception of universal law—to recognise the impossibility even of *any two material atoms* subsisting together without a determinate relation—of any action of the one

or the other, whether of equilibrium or of motion, without reference to a physical cause—of any modification whatsoever in the existing conditions of material agents, unless through the invariable operations of a series of eternally impressed consequences, following in some necessary chain of orderly connexion—however imperfectly known to us.”—Pp. 16, 17.

One assumption, indeed, is involved all along in these statements, and this Mr. Mansel goes on fairly to point out and to justify:—

“Our argument has hitherto proceeded on the assumption that we are justified in regarding the visible world as under the government of a personal God, and in speaking of His acts and purposes in language which implies an analogy between the Divine mind and the human. It now becomes necessary to make some remarks in vindication of the assumption itself, which has been included by recent criticism in the same condemnation with the consequences which we have endeavoured to deduce from it. Of the argument from design, “as popularly pursued,” we are told that it “proceeds on the analogy of a personal agent, whose contrivances are limited by the conditions of the case and the nature of his materials, and pursued by steps corresponding to those of human plans and operations:—an argument leading only to the most unworthy and anthropomorphic conceptions.” We are told again, that “to attempt to reason from law to volition, from order to active power, from universal reason to distinct personality, from design to self-existence, from intelligence to infinite perfection, is in reality to adopt grounds of argument and speculation entirely beyond those of strict philosophical inference.” We are told, again, that “the simple argument from the invariable order of nature is wholly incompetent to give us any conception whatever of the Divine Omnipotence, except as *maintaining, or acting through*, that invariable universal system of physical order and law;” and that “a theism of Omnipotence in any sense deviating from the order of nature must be entirely derived from other teaching.” In order to test the value of these and similar arguments, it will be necessary that we should clearly understand what this *other teaching* is, and what it teaches us; as well as the relation in which it stands to the generalizations and inductions of physical science.”—Pp. 23, 24.

The whole point of the argument in support of miracles is then summed up thus:—

“As regards the general question of the *possibility* of miracles (that of their *reality* must of course be determined by its own special evidence), Paley’s criticism is, after all, the true one:—“Once believe that there is a God, and miracles are not incredible.” For an impersonal God is no God at all; and the conception of a personal God in relation to man necessarily involves that of a divine purpose, and of the manifestation of that purpose in time. Grant this, and there is no *à priori* reason why such a manifestation may not take place at one time as well as at another; why the beginning of a spiritual system at one period may not be as credible as the beginning of a material system at another period. It would indeed be a precarious argument to attempt to reason positively from an *à priori* notion of the divine attributes to the *necessity* of creation or of revelation; but the very conditions which render such an argument doubtful only increase the force of the negative caution, which, refusing to dogmatize on either side concerning what *must be* or *must not be*, is content to seek for such evidence as is within its reach concerning *what is*.”—Pp. 29, 30.

And with the following words of practical suggestion this admirable Essay comes to a close:—

'To these remarks, which are applicable to every age and race of men to whom the Christian evidences may come, it may perhaps not be inappropriate to add a further observation having a more especial reference to ourselves. The very attacks which have been made, in the supposed interests of science, upon the miraculous element of the Gospel narrative, may themselves serve, if rightly considered, to give to that very element a new significance, and to point to a moral purpose more discernible now than of old. An age of advanced physical knowledge has its especial temptations, no less than its especial privileges. Few indeed, it is trusted, will be found to repeat what one great scientific teacher of the present century has been found to assert, that the heavens declare, not the glory of God, but only the glory of the astronomer. Yet this bold and profane language is only the extreme expression of a tendency against which an age like the present has especial need to watch and pray. Against such a tendency it is no small safeguard that men of science should be trained from their earliest childhood in records which at every page tell of the personal presence of Him by whom all things were made, manifested in direct control over the delegated workings of His visible creation. It is but one form of His perpetual presence with His Church, that in founding a Faith destined to ally itself with the intellectual cultivation of all succeeding generations, He should have founded it in such a manner as to furnish, in the record of its origin, a lesson of the spirit in which that cultivation should be pursued, and a safeguard against the perils to which it is especially exposed. If there are times when the very vastness of the material system which science discloses seems to thrust the Author of all to an almost infinite distance from us;—if there are times when we feel almost tempted to echo the wish of the poet, to be "a Pagan suckled in a creed outworn," so that we might but have a clearer sight of the presence of Deity among the phenomena of nature;—if there are times when the heaven that is over our heads seems to be brass, and the earth that is under us to be iron, and we feel our hearts sink within us under the calm pressure of unyielding and unsympathizing law, as those of the disciples of old sank within them under the stormy violence of wind and wave;—at such times we may learn our lesson and feel our consolation, as we turn to those vivid pictures which our Sacred Story portrays of the personal power of the Incarnate God visibly ruling His creation; and may hear through them the present voice of Him who spake on the waters, "Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid."—Pp. 39, 40.

As the subject of miracles was intrusted to Mr. Mansel, so that of prophecy was, with excellent judgment, assigned to Dr. McCaul. Our space will not admit of our following his Essay into its details so fully as we have done that on the corresponding subject of miracles; and we must give only a brief sketch of its contents. After explaining the essential idea involved in the name 'prophet,' and other words, as 'seer, &c.' connected with it, he states and examines the two alternatives which are offered respecting the character of the Hebrew prophets:—

'The prophets themselves affirm that they have the power and utter predictions. Were they impostors, or did they deceive themselves? That they were impostors, is not believed by those Rationalists who have given most attention to this subject, as Gesenius, Ewald, and Knobel, and is disproved by their doctrine and their life. Concerning God they teach that He is One, the Lord, Creator of the heavens and the earth, Everlasting, Almighty, Omniscient, Free, All-wise, Holy, a righteous Judge, a merciful Saviour, the Governor of the world, forgiving iniquity and sin. Their notion of the religion

acceptable to Him is also equally free from fanaticism and formality. They denounce those who "draw near to God with their lips, but remove their heart far from Him." They teach that to reform the life is better than external demonstrations. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices? . . . Wash you; make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow" (Isaiah i. 11—17). "I will have mercy, not sacrifice." They proclaim that honesty, mercy, and humility are the weightiest matters of the Law. "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic. vi. 8). To preach such doctrine was their business; and boldly to reprove all who lived in opposition to it, whether kings, or priests, or people, was their practice, and this without fee or reward, for they received nothing for their prophesying, but often exposed themselves to persecution and death. They sought not wealth, or honour, or favour, or ease. They were temperate, self-denying, patient, valiant for the truth, leaning upon God as their stay, and looking to God alone for their reward. They were neither morose ascetics, nor unlettered fanatics. Married and living amongst the people, in cottages and in courts, they discharged the ordinary duties of citizens. They cultivated letters, and have left a literature unique in the history of the world; if judged according to a human standard, unsurpassed in genius, sublimity, grandeur; but in purity and morality unequalled by any nation in any age. This prophetic order beginning, if reckoned from Samuel, nearly 400 years before the birth of Rome, and closing when the bloom of Grecian genius was only appearing, is, when compared with the state of the world around them, a phenomenon as wonderful as the power of prediction which they claimed. The best days of Greece and Rome can furnish no heroes, patriots, or moral teachers to compare with this long and wonderful succession of holy, disinterested, bold reprovers of vice and preachers of virtue, unambitious examples of genuine patriotism, living for the glory of God, and the good of man; whose writings are so imbued with imperishable and universal truth, that for nearly twenty-four centuries after the death of the last of the goodly fellowship, they have continued and still continue to touch the hearts, and influence the faith, the thoughts and lives, of the wisest, greatest, and most excellent of the human race. That such men could be deceivers, or that imposture could have exercised a power so enduring, is impossible. That they could have been self-deceiving enthusiasts is equally incredible. Neither their doctrine, nor their lives, nor their writings savour of enthusiasm, nor can they be accounted for as mere ebullitions of genius. Why did not the poetic inspiration and colossal intellect of Greece produce similar results? Why did not Euripides prophesy? Why did Plato never rise to moral purity? "It is because of the theocracy," say modern diviners. Moses founded a theocracy, and prophetism was the necessary result. But this is only to remove the difficulty one step farther back. Why did not the Spartan, or Athenian, or Locrian lawgivers, or the royal disciple of Egeria found a theocracy like that of Moses? Why did not their legislations bring forth prophets? In a certain sense prophecy did arise out of the original relation established between God and Israel. The same Divine Being, who commanded the theocracy, gave also the prophets, inspired them with their doctrines, revealed to them the future, and enabled them to utter predictions, far beyond the powers of human foreboding, sagacity or conjecture, which by their fulfilment, of old and in the present times, demonstrate that they were not self-deceiving enthusiasts, but spake as they were moved by Him who knows the end from the beginning.—Pp. 95—97.

Granted, then, that the prophets did indeed believe that they were giving forth prophetic utterances respecting the

future under the immediate influence of God, the question arises, 'Are there such predictions of the future left on record by them as a fact?' With this part of the subject the Essay of Dr. McCaul is mainly occupied; and he examines at length some of the most important prophecies which it has been attempted to explain away. And the conclusion to which he would lead the reader is thus summed up:—

'He must indeed be a man "that leans to his own understanding," who can lightly esteem the judgment of the ancient Jewish Church, and the common consent of all Christian scholars for nearly 1800 years, and believe that he has found what such a goodly company have failed to perceive. But the Christian bows to still higher authority than the common judgment of this mighty host of the great, the good, the wise, and the learned, in so many ages and nations; he learns from Him whose Spirit spake in the prophets, and guided His disciples and Apostles into all truth. Christ and His Apostles have interpreted this chapter of His sufferings, death, and resurrection-glory; and the providence of God has verified the interpretation. Not to speak of the past, our eyes still see the fulfilment of this prediction. The most improbable prophecy in the world was this which predicted that a Jew, despised by his people, numbered amongst transgressors, cut off out of the land of the living, should, nevertheless, prolong his days, be the light of the Gentiles, and God's salvation to the ends of the earth. And yet this is what has been accomplished, and is accomplishing itself before our eyes. In spite of all the pride, prejudice, and power of Greeks and Romans, the ignorance and fury of barbarian invaders, the self-sufficiency of human knowledge, the vices of civilization, Jesus of Nazareth has triumphed, and triumphs, and is still the light of the world. The Christian humbly and thankfully accepts the teaching of the Lord, and the testimony of God's providence. The wondrous outline stands vividly marked on the page of prophecy; the fulfilment as unmistakably inscribed on the prominent pages of the world's history. The one answers to the other, as the mirror to the human face, and he cannot be mistaken. No microscopic investigations of criticism can make the agreement doubtful. He does not despise or disregard the labours of even hostile critics. On the contrary, he carefully considers their every suggestion, thankfully receives the light which they have thrown on words and phrases, acknowledges their diligence, their genius, their learning, and their honesty, so far as their dogmatic prejudices allow them to be impartial. But Christ has spoken, and by Christ's words he abides. He, therefore, believes that the prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; that they uttered predictions; that many of the most seemingly improbable have been fulfilled, and are pledges that the remainder shall also be accomplished. He cannot join in the unbelieving cry, "Where is the promise of His coming?" He does not believe that "since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation," but that Christ "in His majesty rides prosperously on in the cause of truth, and meekness, and righteousness;" and "though the vision tarry," he waits for it, assured that it is "for an appointed time," and that "at the end it shall speak and not lie—it will surely come, it will not tarry."—Pp. 129, 130.

The *second* point, the difficulties raised to the inspiration of the Pentateuch, and to the opinion of its being the work of Moses, is considered in an Essay by Professor Rawlinson. The grounds for believing it to be the work of Moses, internal and external, are given in pp. 239 to 244; and the limitations under

which it is to be regarded as the composition of Moses are laid down in a passage (p. 251) which we have already quoted in a former article,¹ and which we forbear therefore to quote again here. The objections raised against the Book, specific and general, are then given. The general objections are summed up as five:—

‘The authenticity of the Pentateuch has been recently called in question, principally on the following points:—1. The chronology, which is regarded as very greatly in deficiency; 2. The account given of the Flood, which is supposed to magnify a great calamity in Upper Asia into a general destruction of the human race; 3. The ethnological views, which are said to be sometimes mistaken; 4. The patriarchal genealogies, which are charged with being purely mythical; 5. The length of the lives of the Patriarchs, which is thought to be simply impossible; and 6. The duration of the sojourn in Egypt, which is considered incompatible with the number of the Israelites on entering and quitting the country. It is proposed, in the remainder of this paper, to consider briefly these six subjects.’—P. 252.

And the general conclusion arrived at is, that the objections, when fairly and fully considered, are wholly insufficient to invalidate the authenticity of this portion of the Sacred Record.

Of the two specific points, especially objected to in Scripture, which constitute the *third* head, one, the Mosaic Record of Creation, has been assigned to Dr. McCaul, and the other, the Death and Atonement of our Lord, has been undertaken by the Editor, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, himself. The very interesting Essay of Dr. McCaul will well repay perusal. Two points only shall be given here, as specimens of the manner in which the subject is handled by him—the account of the creation of the sun and moon, and the meaning of the word ‘day.’ As to the creation of light, and of the sun and moon, with the difficulties apparently involved in it, he writes:—

‘The next Mosaic statement is found in verses 3-5, “And God said, Let there be light, and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good, and God separated between the light and between the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And evening happened, and morning happened, one day,” and has given occasion to many objections. Celsus found it strange that Moses should speak of days before the existence of the sun. “How did God create the light before the sun?” asked Voltaire. “How did He make the day before the sun was made?” “Modern astronomy,” says D. F. Strauss, “found it contrary to order, that the earth should not only have been created before the sun, but should also, besides day and night, have distinction of the elements and vegetation before the sun.” “Light and the measurement of time are represented as existing before the manifestation of the sun, and this idea, although repugnant to our modern knowledge, has not in former times appeared absurd,” is the objection of ‘Essays and Reviews;’ and, as is evident, is not the result of modern science, having been broached already by Celsus. As, however, recent writers give modern science the credit of it, it becomes necessary to ask, what does modern science teach with regard to the relative ages of the earth and the sun? The

¹ *Christian Remembrancer* for July, p. 86.

answer is, Nothing, absolutely nothing as a scientific certainty. Whether sun and earth were created simultaneously, and in their present relations—or, whether the earth, already created, wandered within the range of solar attraction, or whether, after the sun existed, the earth was called forth within that range, science does not know. It has, however, without any reference to the Book of Genesis, proposed a theory, which has been accepted by some of the most scientific men of these days as highly probable. Had it been devised for the express purpose of removing the supposed difficulties of the Mosaic account, it could hardly have been more to the purpose. It supposes that the whole solar system was originally one mass of vapoury or nebulous matter, which, according to the laws of gravitation, assumed the form of an immense sphere. This sphere received (from without) an impulse which caused it to revolve on its axis from west to east. In consequence of this revolving motion, it became flattened at the poles and swollen in the equatorial region, and in consequence of the greatness of the centrifugal force at the equator, and the contemporaneous condensation and contraction of the nebulous mass, a free revolving ring, similar to that of Saturn, detached itself in the region of the equator. This ring not being of uniform density, and in consequence of contraction, broke in one or more places, and these fragments, in obedience to the laws of gravitation, became a sphere or spheres, that is, a planet, or planets, all necessarily revolving from west to east, round the parent mass. Another ring was formed in like manner, and another planet came into existence, and so on until the whole solar system was complete. A similar process took place with regard to some of the planets, and thus they got their moons.

Now, according to this theory, not only the earth, but all the planets of our system, existed before the sun in its present condition. As these planets are now not self-illuminating, it may be supposed that the rings, when detached from the original nebulous mass, were dark also, and therefore that the equatorial matter of the parent nebulous sphere of which they were composed was also devoid of light—that therefore the sun did not receive its luminous atmosphere until all the planets had been detached. But, until this luminous atmosphere existed, they could not derive their light from the sun. If, on the other hand, it be supposed that these detached rings were luminous, and that the planets formed from them were luminous also, then the planets had a light of their own, independent of the sun. But however that be, so much follows from this theory, that the earth existed before the residuary parent globe could be called the sun, or could perform its office of luminary to the system. If the earth therefore had light during this period, it must have been derived from some other source. That this is possible cannot now be denied. The discoveries with regard to heat, combustion, electricity, galvanism, show that there may be light independent of the sun. It is also now generally received that the sun itself is an opaque body, and that solar light proceeds from a luminous atmosphere by which it is surrounded. The progress of science has, therefore, neutralized the objection that light could not exist before the sun. Indeed, it has done more—it has proved the accuracy of the Mosaic language. Moses does not call the sun "*Or*, light," but "*Ma'or*, a place or instrument of light," a luminary or candlestick, just what modern science has discovered it to be. Thus, so far is the Mosaic doctrine of light from being opposed to recent discoveries, that if Moses had wished to describe the modern doctrine concerning light, he could not have expressed himself more happily. "Scripture does not say that God created the light, or made it, but said, 'Let it be, and it was!' If, then, light be not a separate and definite body, but only vibrations or undulations of ether, somehow set in motion, the sacred writer could not have expressed its appearance in words more beautiful or more agreeable to truth."

Now, this theory of La Place may or may not be true, but it is an offspring

of modern science, and implies, just like the Mosaic account, the pre-existence of the earth before the sun became the luminary of the system. It does, indeed, also imply the pre-existence of the great parent nebulous globe, but this is not contrary to the Mosaic account. Moses does not say that the body of the sun or moon and stars were created on the fourth day, but according to the Hebrew, "God said, Let there be light-holders in the firmament of the heaven, . . . and let them be for light-holders in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, and God made the two great light-holders . . . and God gave *לְיוֹרֵד*, them in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth, and the stars." The Hebrew word, *Asah*, make, may signify "make ready, prepare, dress" (see Gesenius's "Lexicon," in verb.) The creation of the sun or parent globe may be included in verse 1, and the work of the fourth day consisted in furnishing it with its luminous atmosphere. When this took place, and the sun began to shed its light, then the moon, and the earth's fellow planets, "the stars," of verse 16, became luminaries also. The stars of this sixteenth verse are certainly different from those morning stars of which Job speaks, which were in existence long before, and as connected with the sun and moon, seem naturally to mean those belonging to the solar system, and which received their light on the fourth day, when the sun became luminous. Having thus seen how modern science proves that the earth and light might exist, and, according to scientific theory, probably did exist before the sun, it is no longer difficult to conceive, how there might also be a measure of time.—Pp. 209—212.

He then examines the meaning of the word 'day,' a problem which, as is well known, has exercised the ingenuity of many of the most thoughtful and able writers since the progress of geological research has shown the difficulty of accepting the account of creation given in the first chapter of Genesis, if the term 'day' be taken in the limitation which it now has with us. Dr. McCaul gives his own solution of it, which it would be unfair to abridge, and which should be read in full. It is given in pp. 213—216. And the following remarks with which he concludes are calculated to give comfort and repose to many an anxious mind:—

'Thus a comparison of the actual statements of Moses with the discoveries and conclusions of modern science is so far from shaking, that it confirms our faith in the accuracy of the sacred narrative. We are astonished to see how the Hebrew Prophet, in his brief and rapid outline sketched 3,000 years ago, has anticipated some of the most wonderful of recent discoveries, and can ascribe the accuracy of his statements and language to nothing but inspiration. Moses relates how God created the heavens and the earth at an indefinitely remote period before the earth was the habitation of man—geology has lately discovered the existence of a long prehuman period. A comparison with other scriptures shows that the "heavens" of Moses include the abode of angels, and the place of the fixed stars, which existed before the earth. Astronomy points out remote worlds, whose light began its journey long before the existence of man. Moses declares that the earth was or became covered with water, and was desolate and empty. Geology has found by investigation that the primitive globe was covered with an uniform ocean, and that there was a long azoic period, during which neither plant nor animal could live. Moses states that there was a time when the earth was not dependent upon the sun for light or heat, when, therefore, there could be no climatic differences. Geology has lately verified this statement by finding tropical plants and

animals scattered over all parts of the earth. Moses affirms that the sun, as well as the moon, is only a light-holder. Astronomy declares that the sun itself is a non-luminous body, dependent for its light on a luminous atmosphere. Moses asserts that the earth existed before the sun was given as a luminary. Modern science proposes a theory which explains how this was possible. Moses asserts that there is an expanse extending from earth to distant heights, in which the heavenly bodies are placed. Recent discoveries lead to the supposition of some subtle fluid medium in which they move. Moses describes the process of creation as gradual, and mentions the order in which living things appeared, plants, fishes, fowls, land-animals, man. By the study of nature geology has arrived independently at the same conclusion. Where did Moses get all this knowledge? How was it that he worded his rapid sketch with such scientific accuracy? If he in his day possessed the knowledge which genius and science have attained only recently, that knowledge is superhuman. If he did not possess the knowledge, then his pen must have been guided by superhuman wisdom. Faith has, therefore, nothing to fear from science. So far the records of nature, fairly studied and rightly interpreted, have proved the most valuable and satisfying of all commentaries upon the statements of Scripture. The ages required for geological development, the infinity of worlds and the immensity of space revealed by astronomy, illustrate, as no other note or comment has ever done, the Scripture doctrines of the eternity, the omnipotence, the wisdom of the Creator. Let then Science pursue her boundless course, and multiply her discoveries in the heavens and in the earth. The believer is persuaded that they will only show more clearly that "the words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of fire, purified seven times." Let Criticism also continue her profoundly interesting and important work. Let her explore, sift, analyse, scrutinize, with all her powers, the documents, language, and contents of Scripture, and honestly tell us the results. Since the day when Laurentius Valla exposed the fiction of the Imperial donation, she has contributed much to the removal of error, and the advancement of literary, patristic, and historic truth; and Divine revelation has also been illustrated by her labours. It might be shown that even the hostile and sceptical have involuntarily helped in the confirmation of the Christian verity, and that even their labours cannot be neglected without loss. But the student must carefully distinguish between the speculations of individuals and the ascertained settled results of criticism. The theory of any one individual, however learned, laborious, and genial, is only an opinion, perhaps only one of a chaos of conflicting opinions, where sound criticism has found no sure footing. The settled results are those which, after severe testing, have been unanimously accepted by the competent, the sober, and the judicious. The former may be popular for a while, and seem to shake the faith; but they are gradually overthrown by the progress of critical investigation, and take their place in the record of things that were. The history of the last hundred years, since modern criticism took its rise, is sufficient to quiet the believer's mind as to the ultimate result. It tells of theory after theory, propounded by the critics of the day, first applauded, then controverted, then rejected, just like the philosophic systems of the same period, and yet a gradual advance from anti-Christian hostility to an effort after scientific impartiality, and a large amount of positive gain for the right interpretation of Scripture and the confirmation of the old Christian belief. Faith, therefore, feels no more fear of Criticism than of Science, being assured that neither can "do anything against the truth, but for the truth."—Pp. 232—234.

In the Essay of Dr. Thomson the general doctrine of the Atonement of our Lord is first stated, and then the more specific points involved in it are thus clearly pointed out:—

'We are now in a position to see how far the teaching of the New Testament on the effects of the death of Jesus is continuous and consistent. Are the declarations of our Lord about Himself the same as those of James and Peter, John and Paul? and are those of the Apostles consistent with each other? The several points of this mysterious transaction may be thus roughly described:—

1. God sent His Son into the world to redeem lost and ruined man from sin and death, and the Son willingly took upon Him the form of a servant for this purpose; and thus the Father and the Son manifested their love for us.

2. God the Father laid upon His Son the weight of the sins of the whole world, so that He bore in His own body the wrath which men must else have borne, because there was no other way of escape for them; and thus the Atonement was a manifestation of Divine justice.

3. The effect of the Atonement thus wrought is, that man is placed in a new position, freed from the dominion of sin, and able to follow holiness; and thus the doctrine of the Atonement ought to work in all the hearers a sense of love, of obedience, and of self-sacrifice.

In shorter words, the sacrifice of the death of Christ is a proof of Divine love, and of Divine justice, and is for us a document of obedience.'—P. 337.

That this doctrine is declared in Scripture, and has been held by the Church at large, is then shown at length; and the objections which natural reason seems to raise against some points involved in the doctrine are thus stated and answered:—

'Holy Scripture contains the doctrine, and the Church has always taught it. Whence, then, the repugnance to it which some persons of serious and devout minds have expressed? The objections for the most part take the form of a denial that it is possible that one man should suffer for the sin of another; that the wrath of God could be appeased by the sacrifice of one who had done no sin in the place of the sinful. A thoroughgoing sense of man's responsibility for his own acts, and a reluctance to own that the sufferings of the just can ever be the consequence of the sins of others, are the two principal motives at work. How can these be most easily dealt with?

All the difficulties that belong to this question are introduced prior to it by a consideration of sin itself. The conscience of man admits that there is such a thing as guilt; and so strong, decided, and constant is its witness, that there is no fear that mankind in the long run will attempt to explain away the fact that sin exists. But when I am asked to believe that it is against the Divine plan that any other being should take away from me any of the consequences of my guilt, I think myself entitled to say that it is the correlative of this proposition that no one should have brought upon me any of the guilt and its consequences. It is surely not more repugnant to God's justice that another should bear my guilt than that I should be guilty because of another; nay, Divine justice will be more readily reconciled with a plan in which One who is entirely willing to bear my sin should take off its intolerable burden from me who am earnestly desirous to get rid of it, than with a plan in which sinfulness devolves from one who did not mean his own faults to do me harm, upon me who by no means wished to inherit them. But this kind of devolution, or transmission, is a fact of constant occurrence of which no man can be ignorant. We open the works of writers like Broussais and Büchner, and find such importance given to the influence on moral habits of hereditary transmission, of age, sex, maladies, mode of living, and climate, that the doctrine of individual responsibility seems for the moment to be in peril. We need to retire within, and take counsel of conscience, in order to resist the invitation to believe "that what we call free-will is nothing but our being conscious of a will

without being conscious of the antecedents that determine its mode of action," which, translated into plainer nonsense, would mean—being conscious of our will without being conscious that we did not possess one. But all are agreed that outward circumstances and inward constitution derived from parents and ancestors by physical laws, have a great influence upon the character of men. In extreme cases this may be true to the extent of paralysing the will altogether. If a young man has sprung from parents of intemperate habits, who lived by stealing, and has been brought up among companions of the same sort, we shall hardly look to find him any better than the soil in which he grew; and any efforts to amend him and call forth his moral nature would be preceded by the effort to transplant him. Alike in the good and evil qualities of men the effect of hereditary transmission comes under daily notice. And since we are always invited in this question to discuss it in forensic language, and are told that no man can be allowed before a human tribunal to take upon himself the position of the criminal and suffer the punishment of another, because every one arraigned there must bear his own burden, we must remark that, if every one did actually bear his own burden there, human justice would have attained a perfection which it has never yet boasted. In graduated punishments for the same offence there is a rough attempt to take into account the antecedents of the criminal and the amount of his temptation; but these palliations are not proved in evidence, and it is by a rough guess only that an equitable apportionment of punishment is attempted. In defining the line at which mental imbecility extinguishes all sense of responsibility laws have utterly failed, and tribunals have stultified themselves by conflicting decisions. But the arguments on these cases prove that all believe in a class of minds where guilt is just imputable and no more,—where the mental debility, often congenital, all but extinguishes the moral offence. In cases of such nice difficulty, mistakes must be made; punishment must fall on the wrong man. Nor is this mere speculation; a man has been decided insane at one place for a crime for which another man at another place has been hanged, according as the judge and jury made prominent in their minds the safety of society or consideration for the supposed criminal. Capital punishment has fallen upon men who, upon the same facts before a different tribunal, would have been judged to have exercised no choice at all, but to have acted out the course to which birth and disease and the like compelled them. Absolute compulsion of this kind is no doubt rare; but absolute freedom is more than rare, it is impossible. Men enter this world the heirs of passions, perhaps cultivated in the last generation to an unnatural height; they are nurtured on bad examples and a low morality, so that they cannot do the things that they would. And it is the rule, and not the exception, that men's moral actions are tinctured with the colour of the actions of others before and around them, which they could not possibly have caused. Now, if these facts are admitted,—if, instead of that perfect isolation of responsibility, which some insist on, a joint responsibility is the universal rule,—with what show of reason can they pretend that it is on this ground that the Christian scheme is untenable? Look into the black London alleys teeming with ignorance, improvidence, and vice; do you not see written in those faces eloquent in wretchedness, "We did not place ourselves here: were the choice given us freely, we would not be as we are"? Then what do we think of the consistency of those who see guilt brought on by others, but think it revolting that another should take it off? Living comments upon the words "In Adam all die" abound, and cannot be blotted out: it ought not then to revolt our moral sense that those other words are added, "In Christ shall all be made alive." The latter words, in fact, go far to solve the mystery of the former. For the constant transmission of sinfulness, the heritage of sins bequeathed from the fathers to their children, is revolting to the moral sense when severed from the thought of a Deliverer. The message

from Heaven to us is, "Ye are all of one family, partakers of the family heritage of sin, and wretchedness, and ruin; and yet every one of you driven by the stimulus of conscience to protest against the ruin, and to erect yourselves above it. Ye are accustomed to this derived destruction, this hereditary partnership in guilt; lift your eyes one step further back, to that common Father from whom ye sprung, from whom ye have lived in separation. By taking your nature I will re-establish that lost connexion, I will make the Father's lost favour accessible to you again. I will undo the curse, by placing myself under it. I will sanctify the flesh, which the sin of generations has made unclean. For I am partaker of the Father's nature, and the power over you which belongs to Him is mine also; and I am partaker of your nature in all save in the sin of it; and thus I am the Mediator between God and man."—Pp. 352—355.

And again, the difficulty which is felt by some from what our Lord, it is involved, became and suffered for us is thus met in a passage which has a practical force over and above its immediate controversial use:—

'But you that are so jealous lest the name of sin should attach to the sinless One, carry the jealousy another step. When the Pharisees revile and the Priests entrap our Lord, and when the scourging and the buffets and the spitting mangle and defile His innocent frame, you think that nature itself should give tokens of indignation. And yet, how close to God sin has ever come! how sins have ever polluted and defiled the world, which is His temple! and you have not conceived of the sins in that light, as sins that touch Him. When a man slays his brother, or pollutes the virtue of a woman, and each is dear to the Almighty Maker, does not the murderer smite God, and the betrayer spit upon Him? and the long-suffering Ruler of the world bears, as in His bosom, all our wayward sins, and weaves them into the web of His providence, and contrives an order of things in which these evil elements may work and not destroy. Jealous of the Son's contact with sin, can we not, by a larger reach of the same morality, conceive that the Father's contact with, and permission of sin, is a profound mystery? Can you not see in this fact a greater hideousness in evil, since every day that it is permitted seems to impugn the justice or the power of Him who could abolish every sin, with the doers of it, by the breath of His mouth? If so, let us at least assent to the position that a disease so utterly past our comprehension may require means to cure it that shock the ordinary conclusions of our conscience; and that a wider view, if we could stand high enough to take it, might correct our crude impressions.'—Pp. 362, 363.

And, once more:—

'It has been said, "that this doctrine represents the Almighty as moved with fury at the insults offered to His Supreme Majesty, as impatient to pour forth His fury upon some being, as indifferent whether that being deserves it or not, and as perfectly appeased upon finding an object of vengeance in His own innocent Son. It has been said, that a doctrine which represents the Almighty as sternly demanding a full equivalent for that which was due to Him, and as receiving that equivalent in the sufferings of His Son, transfers all the affection and gratitude of the human race from an inexorable Being, who did not remit any part of His right, to another being who satisfied His claim. It has been said, that a translation of guilt is impossible, because guilt is personal; and that a doctrine which represents the innocent as punished instead of the guilty, and the guilty as escaping by this punishment, contradicts the first principles of justice, subverts all our ideas of a righteous government,

and, by holding forth an example of reward and punishment dispensed by Heaven, without any regard to the character of those who receive them, does encourage men to live as they please." So the objections were summed up many years since, and there is little to alter after the recent controversy. Now, most of these objections have arisen from a crude and one-sided way of stating the doctrine on the part of its friends, and disappear when all the elements of the truth are taken in. Sin exists: and therewith must enter a host of contradictions. Sin is that which turns the love of God into wrath; not into the passion of wrath as men feel it, but to the intention of visiting with punishment. With sin, the face of God is altered against us and turned away. We know the theological objections to this mode of speaking, but there is no other open to us. God cannot change; but yet His purpose towards us is changed in its workings by ourselves. And this enormous power all classes of Christians assign to sin, that it can dam up and divert the current of Divine love, that set so strongly towards us. We are obliged to pick our expressions, whenever we touch the subject, lest sin itself should be laid to the account of Him who is the governor of the world, and suffers sin in the world. Sin turns love to wrath, the life of our souls to the death of them, our light to darkness, our free adherence to God to enmity against Him. From this view of sin, as something which is suffered to thwart the free workings of God's love, and which casts shadows as of the darkness of Gethsemane over all the scenes of history, where evil is suffered to come in and overcloud the good, there is no escape except in the pantheistic view, which reads all sin and evil as good in a transition state. And against that view conscience will ever protest; for it is the best proof of our still retaining vestiges of good that conscience finds all the suggestions of physiological materialists, and of metaphysical pantheists, powerless to lull to sleep the sense of individual guilt, which yet she has so strong an interest in getting rid of. To remove sin and its consequences God sent His Son, the Eternal Word of the Father, to become truly man as He was truly God, and to mediate between men and Him for their relief. It is not true, whatever friend or foe shall say it, that God looked forth on his works to find some innocent man able and willing to bear the weight of His wrath, and found Jesus and punished Him. It is all false, because it is only half true. The Son of God took our nature upon Him, and therewith the sins of it, at least in their consequences; not because he became one man among many, but because when God takes man's nature He still has divine right and power over all, and so manhood is taken into God. That sinfulness should press upon the Son of God, in any of its consequences, revolts us at first; nay, it was intended to revolt us and thereby to secure our repentance; and jealous for his honour we protest that of sin He shall know nothing. Yes; but we have been flaunting our sins in the face of the Father, to His displeasure, ever since we were born; using the limbs He makes and keeps strong, for purposes of lust and violence; quickening the pulses that He controls, with draughts of passionate excitement: in a word, sinning before God's face and under His hand. Is it less shocking that sin should be in the world which is God's, than that it should be in the manhood which is Christ's? No: both before and after the incarnation sin is a contradiction; and it is less difficult to conceive sin taken by the Son upon Himself for a time and by way of remedy, than it is to understand it as suffered by the Father always as a permitted destruction. The punishment in this transaction falls on the innocent. And we are told that such a doctrine is cruel, unjust, and useless: cruel, because it punishes where it could forgive; useless, because it misses the true end of punishment in striking the guiltless, which can never deter from guilt; and unjust, because it falls on one who knows no sin. But it is not cruel, if it thereby marks for ever the enormity of sin which needed such a sacrifice; it is not useless, if it changed the relation of man to God, and if in fact it has ever since been turning men to holiness and

"drawing all men unto" Jesus; and it is not unjust, because the Father's will to punish never outstripped the Son's to suffer, and because His death was a solemn offering of Himself in love, for man's redemption. Nor can there be any tendency to transfer from the severe Father to the loving Son, the love we owe to both; for the mode of our redemption was designed by both, and the Son adopts the Father's just sentence, and the Father sanctions the Son's loving self-sacrifice. Nor is there the least pretext for saying that this doctrine encourages men to live as they please, by holding forth the spectacle of rewards earned for those who do not deserve them and punishments warded off from those who deserve them well: since the blood of the Redeemer, all-sufficient as it is to cleanse the sins of the world, saves from wrath only those who repent and turn to Him.—Pp. 363—365.

And the duty of preaching the doctrine of Christ's atonement clearly and fully is thus solemnly urged:—

'The power of the doctrine of the Atonement has been felt wherever the Gospel has come. It has carried comfort to sinners where nothing else could do so. Wherever the conviction of sin has been deepest, the power of the Cross has been most conspicuous; and this in the face of objections which it was not left to modern times to suggest, against such a punishment for such a deliverer. Let it still be preached; and our lesson from these controversies be that we preach the whole of it, so far as Scripture informs and our mind comprehends. Let us not so exalt the justice of God that we seem to record the harshness of a tyrant, and not the device of a Father seeking to bring His children back. Let us not so dwell on the love of Christ as to forget that one great moral purpose of this sacrifice was to set the mark of God's indignation upon sin. Let us not so offer the benefits of the Cross to our people as to lose sight of it as a means of their crucifying their own flesh and dying to their own sins. He bare our sins in His own body on the tree; He is our ransom, our propitiation; He is made sin for us; because God is just. He laid down His life for the sheep, out of love, and God so loved the world that He gave Him for this labour; because God is love: and we are to run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of our faith; because the work of justice and love has restored us to our position of moral freedom and moral life, and we must live as the redeemed servants of our Lord.'—Pp. 365, 366.

Here the general argument in defence of Christianity may be considered to be closed. But there are some points naturally arising out of it, and connected with it, which have been touched on in the '*Aids to Faith*,' and which must not, therefore, be omitted here.

First, the opposite view to that which accepts Scripture as a simple inspired record of what actually took place is put forth, and its history from its rise in Germany to its adoption by some in England is traced, by Mr. Cook. The general idea of '*Ideology*' he thus explains:—

'The term Ideology is strange, and certainly not welcome to English ears; nor is it, perhaps, much to be feared that the system which bears the name will find many adherents, or exercise any direct influence upon the current of religious thought. A summary rejection may, therefore, at first sight, appear to be an effectual and satisfactory mode of disposing of its claims. Such indeed might be the case if we considered merely the abstract speculations with which ideology is connected: but in its applications and bearings it assumes a very practical form. It touches the most important questions of

morality, the most vital truths of religion. It affects the veracity or trustworthiness of the witnesses of revelation, the genuineness and integrity of its documents, their origin and interpretation, and by a strictly logical, though not perhaps a very obvious consequence, the relations between the Church, her people, and ministers. Such points must be scrutinized; the true character of the system, the principles on which it rests, and its inevitable results ought to be distinctly ascertained. Should it prove, as in all former controversies has been the case, that some great truths, not generally recognised in their fulness, find in the system, false and pernicious as it may be, a partial and inadequate expression; and that the very objections of ideologists enable us to comprehend, somewhat more clearly than heretofore, some essential characteristics of the Christian revelation, that result, at least, will be welcome to those who watch with interest, though not without perplexity and apprehension, the progress of a religious speculation in an age remarkable for fearlessness, and, it may be hoped, for sincerity, in the pursuit of truth.

The object of Ideology, as it is described in the writings of Strauss, who first presented it in a complete and systematic form, was to reconcile belief in the spiritual truths which he recognised as the ideal basis of Christianity, with rejection of all the miraculous events, and by far the largest portion of the narrative, with which those truths are connected. The rejection rests upon an assumption of the utter incredibility of miracles, as irreconcilable with philosophical principles, and as contrary to experience; and it is supported, as we shall see presently, by an unscrupulous use of arguments supplied by various schools of infidelity. But the chief peculiarity of the system is that, subject to this assumption, it professes to account for the existence of a belief in the facts, and for the form in which the facts are represented, and to explain the real significance of narratives involving supernatural elements. The ideologist, or idealist, asserts that such narratives are myths, which it would be absurd to regard as true in the letter, but which may yet be treated with respect, and even with reverence, as symbols and representations of ideas which are of permanent interest and importance to mankind. The facts did not, and could not occur in the manner or under the circumstances described in Scripture, but they may yet be substantially, that is ideally true, as products of human consciousness, as expressing at least the aspirations or presentiments of a nature akin to the divine. Many writers of this school (and Strauss himself in several passages) adopt at times a far more offensive tone, and do not hesitate to attribute the origin of large portions of the Gospel narrative to the prepossessions of the writers, to their ignorance, credulity, and fanaticism, or to selfish and interested motives. We do not propose to discuss those speculations. The only form in which the theory of ideologists is calculated to produce any effect upon generous and elevated minds, is that which accepts the ideal principles as true, while it denies the historical character of the relations in which they are bodied forth.—Pp. 133, 134.

And the position of the ideologist, in contrast with that of the simple Christian believer, is thus stated:—

‘It is just at this point that the controversy between the Christian and the ideologist arises. The question is simply this: are the same principles applicable to secular history and to the records of a scheme which is professedly one of divine interpositions? We see perfectly well that if they were applicable, the conclusions of the ideologist could scarcely be controverted. To one who does not view the sacred narrative as a thing apart, not merely in certain details, but in its entire construction, resting altogether upon different principles from those which he is accustomed to apply in historical investigations, its facts, whether or not what is commonly called miraculous, have *prima facie* this characteristic of fiction. The long series of events recorded in the Bible,

connected for ages with one family, but involving in its consequences all the destinies of mankind, unquestionably exemplifies certain ideal principles, and that throughout and completely, in its organic structure and in its several parts. In the opinion of one who dismisses, without argument, all notions of supernatural intervention, such a fact is unaccountable, excepting upon the supposition that the history has been invented or essentially changed in character by the writers who have transmitted the traditional records in their actual state. Whether he attribute this to design, to the influence of high or low feelings, to superstition, ignorance, prejudice, or, on the other hand, to noble and generous aspirations, may be admitted to be a matter of considerable import so far as regards his own spiritual state; but the result is alike destructive so far as regards the bearings of the argument upon the substantial verity of the Scriptures. The more solemn and majestic the events, the more completely in the ideologist's mind do they bear the essential character of a myth. In no portion of Holy Writ is such criticism more destructive than in that which presents to us the life of our Lord—that perfect embodiment of an ideal, in itself without a parallel, in its realization transcending all conceptions of the human mind.

We thus account for the position of the ideologist, and in accounting for it we seem to gain a singularly distinct perception of what is surely the most positive and peculiar characteristic of Christianity. The attributes, the very nature of God, are manifested in the government of the world, viewed by the light of Scripture, but most specially and completely in the Person and works of the Son. Just in this point consists the real contrast between sacred and profane history. Profane history may not, and indeed, it cannot contradict, but it certainly does not distinctly teach, some of the most momentous and necessary truths—such as the unity of God, the unity of the human race, the unity of human history, the universal principles of morality, or the systematic development of the purposes of an almighty and loving will. Historians, excepting so far as they have drawn light from other sources, do not in point of fact distinctly set forth all or any of these truths. Sacred history teaches them all, and teaches them not by mere abstractions, but by the representation of events in which our conceptions of what is right, reasonable, and desirable, find a perfect satisfaction. Our only postulate is one which cannot be denied on rational grounds by any but atheists—that God has the will and the power of making Himself known to His creatures. That granted, the reasonableness and therefore the probability of such a manifestation of Himself can scarcely be denied. The intellect, freed from the shackles of sin and knowledge falsely so called, fastens with joy upon the one clue to the labyrinthine mazes of speculation. Holding it *a priori* to be possible that the Divine love may choose thus to deliver us from dark and dreary bewilderment, we gladly accept the proofs that such has been His gracious will. We believe that in another state the ideal will be thoroughly and universally realized, that each act and each existence, in its place and its degree, will be then a perfect exemplification of some eternal reality; and of this we are equally convinced, that a foretaste and anticipation of that future harmony has been vouchsafed in the Scriptural narrative, most especially in the life and person of Jesus Christ.

It is a strange and instructive contrast which is thus presented between the effects of the Scriptural narrative upon the ideologist and upon the simple-hearted Christian. The traces of harmonious accordance impress the former with the conviction that he is listening to the record of a dream—beautiful it may be, and significant,—the dream of a poet or a saint, of a spirit full of divine yearnings and sympathies, but still a dream—an empty, unsubstantial dream. The Christian sees in that accordance the evidence of a divine power; of all effects upon his mind the very last would be a doubt as to the reality of the objective facts which show how that power has been exerted for the regeneration of man.—Pp. 140—142.

Again, the question of the moral propriety of one who holds views thus opposed to the simple belief of the Christian Church retaining his position as a minister of the Church, is thus put by the same writer:—

‘The question of course arises—how is it possible that men of honour holding such opinions can retain, or endure, their position as ministers and teachers of a Church, which, liberal as it undoubtedly is in dealing with all questions about which believers in a positive revelation may conscientiously differ, has no less certainly pronounced a clear and decisive sentence upon each and all the points controverted or denied by ideologists? That the difficulty is felt is sufficiently obvious. The principal object of the only treatise in which the leading principles of this form of neology have been distinctly commended by a minister of the Church of England, is to justify the conduct of himself and those who maintain the same views. In this part of his undertaking he has been supplied with weapons from the same foreign armoury. In the writings of all schools of rationalism and neology, a prominent place is assigned to the vindication of absolute liberty of sceptical speculation, not merely for students, but for professors of theology. We need not, however, trace the connexion. That is of little moment. The arguments in this case have at least the merit of being intelligible and practical. Whether the Church has at present, and has had from the beginning, safeguards to preserve her doctrines from corruption,—whether she has a right, and has exercised the right, to exact from all her ministers a pledge that so long as they retain her commission they will deliver those doctrines in their integrity to the people—whether the act of subscription by which the ministers give such pledge involves a moral, or a mere legal obligation—such questions stand upon independent grounds, and may be discussed without any reference to the sources from which the arguments we have to consider may, or may not, be derived.’—Pp. 164, 165.

He goes on to point out very clearly the difference between what we promise to *believe* and what we promise to *teach*:—

‘This, it is said, is equivalent to a *promise* that a man will believe, and that is a promise which it is not in his power to fulfil. But so far as regards *belief*, subscription is not a promise, but a declaration. Whatever promise is implied concerns not our convictions, but our acts. We pledge ourselves simply to this, that, so long as we hold an office of trust, we will not contravene the purposes for which it was instituted. The objects of our faith are, indeed, immutable truths; but, knowing the changeableness of the subjective faculties which apprehend them, and the manifold disturbances to which spiritual development is liable, we make no promise that we will retain those convictions; although, from the very nature of convictions touching the highest interests of our being, we entertain a hope, a trust, a something in all honest men approaching to, and in single-hearted believers identified with, a confident assurance that we shall retain them to the end. The promise, however, as to acts is binding, on the plainest grounds of moral obligation, and that without any reference to the possible contingency of legal penalties and disqualifications in case of its violation.’—P. 177.

And the moral obligation which any one is under who has ceased to believe the doctrines which are essentially those of the Church of which he professes to be a minister, is exhibited with a force which must bring it home to every thoughtful mind:—

‘It leaves but one alternative. He cannot do the work which he has undertaken, cannot preach the doctrines, cannot proclaim the facts which are the

very foundation of the Church: how can he retain the trust? If people did not understand this to be our feeling as ministers, they would speedily seek for some other guarantee. If it were generally believed that, when called upon to clear himself from "odious imputations," a minister might put a stop to all further inquiry by simply renewing his subscription, with a clear understanding that thereby he means no more than that he recognises a legal obligation, retaining the right of explaining away, or even denying privately and publicly, the very statements to which he puts his hand, the whole body of the laity would scout the very notion of subscription, would reject it as illusory, as a mere sham. The only light in which they look upon subscription is, that it is a means of ascertaining what truths a man holds, and what he holds himself bound to teach—not surely upon what terms he may consider himself justified in retaining office or emoluments in the Church. They will be prepared to allow time for consideration to any man harassed by perplexing doubts: no man would be regarded with more entire sympathy and tenderness than one whose spirit might be overwrought in its struggles with storms which haunt the higher regions of intellectual life: but so long as he works, prays, preaches, administers the sacraments of the Church, or discharges the kindred and no less responsible duty of forming the character of youth under the sanction of the ministerial office, laymen presume, and would be scandalized to hear it doubted, that he holds substantially the convictions which he professed, when formally, publicly, deliberately, at a most critical moment of his life, he signed his name in token of unfeigned assent to the Articles of his Church.'—Pp. 180, 181.

Again, it has been well pointed out in the Essay of Canon Browne, that even if the doctrine of the inspiration of Holy Scripture be denied, the Bible still retains much of its value as a simple historical record of events.

'Many feel,' he writes, 'that, if they must give up a high doctrine of inspiration, they give up Christianity; and yet they think that a high doctrine is scarcely tenable. Such a feeling is not unnatural, and yet it is not wholly true. All the history, and even all the great doctrines of the Gospel, might be capable of proof, and so deserving of credence, though we were obliged to adopt almost the lowest of the modern theories of inspiration. For instance, all, or almost all, the arguments of Butler, Paley, Lardner, and other like authors, are independent of the question, "What is the nature and degree of Scriptural inspiration?" Paley, for instance, undertakes to prove the truth of Christ's resurrection and of the Gospel history, and thence the truth of the doctrines which Christ taught to the world. But this he argues out, for the most part, on principles of common historical evidence. He treats the Apostles as twelve common men, of common honesty and common intelligence. If they could not have been deceived, and had no motive to deceive the world, then surely we must accept their testimony as true. But if their testimony is true, Jesus Christ must have lived, and taught, and worked miracles, and risen from the dead, and so in Him we have an accredited witness sent from God. His teaching, therefore, must have been the truth; and if we have good grounds for believing that His disciples carefully treasured up His teaching, and faithfully handed it on to us, we have then in the New Testament an unquestionable record of the will and of the truth of God. Even if the Apostles and Evangelists had no special inspiration, yet, if we admit their care and fidelity, we may trust to their testimony, and so accept their teaching as true.

So then, even if we were driven to take the lowest view of inspiration, we are not bound to give up our faith.'—P. 301.

But, assuming that Scripture is indeed a divinely-inspired record, there still remains the question, How is this record to be *studied*? How far is the Bible to be interpreted in the same

way as any other book? It is to these questions that the concluding Essay of Dean Ellicott is chiefly directed; and we heartily commend again the 'simple and obvious' (to use the writer's own words, p. 439) practical suggestions contained in it, not merely to the professed theological student, but to all who would study earnestly and intelligently the Word of God. It is to be regretted, we think, that the writer did not give a more full explanation of the passages by which he illustrates his rules from time to time. But what he has written will at least stimulate inquiry, where it does not in itself satisfy the mind. Two remarks only we would quote from the Essay. One is, as to the spirit in which we should come to the study of Scripture:—

'Ere, however, we enter into these discussions, let one point be clearly understood,—that there *is* a requisite, a necessary preparation for the study of the Scripture, which we assume throughout, a preparation of more value than a knowledge of all the rules and canons of the wisest interpreters in the world: that requisite and preparation is preliminary *prayer*. It is not necessary to enlarge upon a subject which speaks for itself; it is not necessary to commend what the very instincts of the soul tell us is a preparation simply and plainly indispensable. We allude to it as by its very mention serving to hallow our coming remarks, and as useful in reminding us, in the pride and glory of our intellectual efforts, that it is more than probable that the very simplest reader that takes his translated Bible on his knees, and reads with prayer that he may understand, will attain a truer and more inward knowledge of the words than will ever be vouchsafed to him who, with all the appliances of philology and criticism, reads the original but forgets to mark its holy character, and to pray that he may not only read, but may also learn and understand. Would to God that this rule were of more universal adoption, and had been of late regularly more observed; for then we may be well assured that none of the scornfulness and rash modes of interpretation against which we have now to protest would ever have been put forth, and have tried, as they now are trying, both the faith and the patience of humbler students of the Word.

One further preliminary and requisite in the case of the interpreter of Scripture we must here allude to, both on account of its own intrinsic importance, and still more in consequence of the startling way in which it has been recently neglected. That requisite is *candour*. Next, in the work of interpretation, to a prayerful and humble stands a candid and honest spirit,—a brave and faithful spirit, that knowing and believing that God is a God of Truth, hesitates not to state with all clearness and simplicity the results to which humble-minded investigation seems in each case to lead,—that scorns to falter and explain away, to gloss or to idealize,—that shrinks not from frankly specifying all the details of the apparent discrepancy, be it with other portions of Scripture, with science, or with history, believing thus that the true reconciliation will hereafter be more readily discovered,—in a word, that has faith clearly to tell the dream, and patience to wait for the interpretation thereof. We cannot but observe that even sounder interpreters both of our own and other times have often sadly failed in this particular. We own with sorrow that there have ever been over-eager Uzzahs among us that have sought to upbear the endangered truth with aids that have brought on themselves their own chastisement. We admit, alas! that good and earnest men have sometimes been driven by anxieties and antagonisms into patently inadmissible solutions; we know that they have urged untenable accommodations, and we are even willing to believe, as our opponents tell us, that they have dwelt on evidence that was in their favour, and have been very in-

sufficiently sensitive to that which was against them. This we know and admit, but at the same time we fail not to observe that, as our coming examples will show, they who have brought this charge against others lie grievously open to it themselves, and that it is indeed time that both parties should desist from courses which do such deep dishonour to the Word of God, and imply such an utter want both of faith and integrity.'—Pp. 419—421.

The other is as to the difficulties which, in spite of study, in spite of candour, in spite of prayer, may still remain, perhaps, for our probation, only to be solved after a long time, if, indeed, they are to be solved in time at all, and are not to be left to be cleared up only in a future world.

'There will be,' he writes, 'for a time, perhaps for all time, apparent difficulties. When new questions arise, at first many will feel that it is hopeless to attempt to solve them. Some will despair, some will try to smother inquiry; some will rush into atheism, and others will fall back into superstition. Patience is the proper temper for an age like our own, which is in many ways an age of transition. The discoveries of Galileo seemed more alarming to his contemporaries than any discoveries in geology or statistics can seem to us. We see no difficulty in Galileo's discoveries now. Such things, then, are probably the proper trials of our faith. Sober views, patience, prayer, a life of godliness, and a good conscience, will, no doubt, keep us from making shipwreck of faith. What now seems like a shadow may only be the proof that there is a light behind it. And even if at times there should come shadows seeming like deep night, we may hope that the dawn of the morning is but the nearer.'—P. 321.

And here we close our sketch of the leading truths involved in this excellent book. It is a delightful task to pass from the study of a volume on its controversial side, to the study of the same work as it contains more or less an independent system of dogmatic truth, however that system may have been called forth by the necessity of meeting erroneous views on the other side. It is as if we should revisit a fortress in which we once saw defenders engaged with an enemy in mortal strife, and contemplate it anew as it stands in its solid strength in time of peace. The Christian, indeed, has to maintain this twofold condition, this twofold attitude, in every state, and in every period of individual and national life. While he is to be calmly and peacefully, so far as he may, growing in knowledge and holiness of life, through the power of the Holy Spirit and the study of the Word of God, he is also a soldier of the Cross, a member of the militant Church on earth, engaged with foes visible and invisible, in doing battle for his faith and his integrity of life for the service and the glory of his Saviour and his God. And we thank, therefore, those who have laboured to forge that armour, and to rear those defences on the frontier, as it were, of the enemy's country, by means of which we may be enabled better to meet the enemy when he assails us, and to stand our ground firmly against his varied and insidious attacks.

ART. V.—*Female Life in Prison.* By A PRISON MATRON.
Hurst and Blackett.

THIS work presents an important subject in so new a point of view that to many of its readers it will be a revelation. Others have written of female prisoners—chaplains, philanthropists, lady visitors, persons who have been permitted occasional intercourse with prison life, or who have stated duties there; but the present writer lifts the veil from the daily, hourly existence of the miserable class of female convicts, and is the first, as far as we are aware, spending her life among them, and watching them at all hours of every day, who has told her experience; and told it with a distinctness, straightforwardness, and command of her subject, which enforce conviction, and powerfully impress the reader. Her purpose, beyond the natural wish to record her observations in a form sure to excite interest, seems to be to plead for her class—prison matrons, as they are called—whom she endeavours to prove, and, we think, succeeds in proving, to be overworked, their energies unduly tasked, and their services underpaid. Fourteen or fifteen hours a day of incessant labour and vigilance, and almost incessant worry, amongst beings wild, crafty, and desperate as their charges are represented to be, must be too heavy a strain on body and mind for women to bear without such a drain on health and strength, and wearing out of spirits, as Government ought not to require of its servants. The term ‘matron’ is a misnomer, for, as a class, they are young women eligible at twenty-five, some having been elected at an earlier age. And she suggests that for these ‘officers,’ as they are further designated, the title of ‘sister’—‘if it did not savour too much of Romanism’—would be more appropriate and more suggestive of their work, and of the spirit in which it should be carried out. They are, according to her report, in most cases women of education and refinement, as they should be always; interested in their work, and carrying it out with tenderness and judgment. For the sake of the prisoners, too, she argues that the staff should be enlarged; for women need more individual attention than men, and cannot be treated in masses and by general rules in the degrees possible with men. And this we can readily believe. If women cannot be trained in large masses, neither can they be reformed and punished without losing many important opportunities for favourable influence.

Putting aside the example of zealous useful labour set us by these youthful matrons, and the good worked by them amongst the more tractable of their charges in some few redeeming instances of penitence and reformation, this book must be a sort of shock to the general reader; being, as it is, a long comment on the text, that it is easier for the leopard to change his spots, than for those to do good that are accustomed to do evil; and giving us a veritable glimpse into Pandemonium such as no other systematic review of prison life has done before, for the reason the author gives, that it is only the officials of a prison that can see prisoners at their worst. Towards occasional visitors they can exercise self-control, but anything like lasting self-control is incompatible with the feminine nature sunk in vice; and lost to self-respect, as the majority of these women are. It is much easier to believe in crimes, the motive to them, the impulses and temptations which hurry men into them, than to realize their effect upon the character, and what an unresisting abandonment to evil influences results in. It is more difficult and painful still to imagine a woman without any of the qualities we attribute to her sex. Not that the worst are wholly unsexed; bad women are not more like men than good ones—in some cases they are less so: all the weaknesses of the feminine organization are, indeed, concentrated in them, but there is a class of qualities which we are accustomed to think inseparable from womanhood, and it is a shock to find out our mistake. This writer, after her experience of prison life, quotes Tennyson:—

‘ For men at most differ as heaven and earth,
But women worst and best, as heaven and hell.’

Probably the warders on the men’s side of Milbank prison would have something to say in modification of this distinction, yet they agree in the difference being a wide one between bad men and bad women; a thoroughly depraved woman is more lost to reason than a man can become:—

“How you ladies manage to live, in such a constant state of excitement, is a puzzle to us on the men’s side,” a Milbank warder said to me one day; “our hours are as long, but the male convicts are quiet and rational, and obey orders. It must be a hard time for all of you.”—*Female Life in Prison*, vol. ii. p. 4.

A woman dead to shame and lost to reason almost ceases to be a human being; it is not easy to distinguish between her state and actual madness; and some delineations of temper in this work are scarcely compatible with sanity, though, because there are no illusions, the culprit is necessarily treated as responsible. Yet in creatures possessed with almost demoniacal fury or malice, we see strange glimpses of tempers and qualities, with which in the

germ we are all familiar. The book is a suggestive one. Here are the extremes of vices, to which we only see remote tendencies in ourselves, our friends, our acquaintance in the outer world; but enough to wake painful sympathies, to see horrible likenesses, to make us own a common nature. We begin to realize, more than, in thoughtless security, men care to do, all we owe to the beneficent chains of decorous habit, to immunity from extreme temptation, to training in the humanities of life. There are people, it seems, who have been cut off from all these. We do not believe of any human beings that they have had no chance, no conscience pleading within, no example different from and above that which they have uniformly followed; but, as compared to ourselves, they have been without all privileges and advantages. These, as children, have never learnt, and it would have been out of place could they have spoken, the simple lines—

‘Not more than others I deserve,
Yet God has given me more;’

for from the first they have been outcasts of society. Why there are beings so neglected, so lost, why there are these differences, is an inscrutable mystery; our part, as we realize them, is to recognise a work for the more favoured to do, and to inquire what the share of each must be. Every prison suggests such ideas—but nowhere so forcibly as in the case of female convicts—and to see this abandonment, this extreme degradation in woman, is at once pitiable and revolting. As art personifies all graces, all virtues, under feminine forms—Justice, Mercy, Beauty, Intellect,—so Satan stamps his mark on this yielding, impressible material; and when he would represent sullenness, fury, craft, malignity, shamelessness, impenitence, despair, he possesses with them some woman’s nature, trained from her cradle in ignorance and sin.

One matter for encouragement we gather here, where we should scarcely have expected to find it, which is, that good teaching is seldom absolutely thrown away. The mind which, however unwillingly or with however little seeming profit, has received some religious truths in childhood is in a different condition from one whose earliest impressions were all evil. As far as appearances go, a tender mother, a careful home, school, and church, may be all forgotten—their good influences disregarded, their memory trampled upon—yet every seed thus sown is not utterly eradicated. No good early teaching can be quite lost while thought lasts. It asserts itself at chance moments; it enables the besotted intellect to attach meaning to better ideas when they are presented to it; it interposes itself at seasons of

softening or repose, striking some chord which is never developed in a childhood restricted to things low and base:—and this record gives us the names, and something of the history, of many whose knowledge of men and things has from their birth been exclusively of this sort. Women are perhaps, from their impressible natures, more the victims of ill training than men; and there are women who have all their lives been strangers to the idea which every girl is supposed to be born with of what a woman should be; to the notions of reserve, modesty, self-respect, restraint, decorum, industry, regard for appearances, obedience to custom, deference for opinion, horror of shame, which in some degree we consider inseparable from womanhood, which, whether suppressed or not, we assume sometimes to have been there or they would not *be* women. There are women in our prisons to whom every appeal on the presumption of this innate knowledge would be as much thrown away as on a lioness, or she-bear, or the pythoness of the Zoological Gardens; who, as far as we see, have no sense of dignity or purity, and no admiration for them. They seem never to have heard of the power and goodness of God, never to have felt the most transient working of religion in the soul. When the chaplain preaches to them, or makes individual efforts to reach the stony and dead heart, they frankly own themselves perplexed; they cannot tell 'what the parson is driving at.' It is often objected to the efforts of every order of teachers—whether in pulpits, schools, or by any other systematic mode of instructing and training the less fortunate classes—that the good done bears no appreciable relation to the labour, fuss, and noise in the doing; but it is something if they secure all who come within sound of their teaching from a certain extremity of ignorance, make them, for ever so little time, take in an idea of what religion and goodness are, and what they themselves ought to be; so that they can henceforth understand the language of exhortation, hold some ideas in common with good men, and be open, intellectually, at least, to the working of higher influences than they habitually seek and live amongst.

We learn one thing of woman's natural graces from such extreme instances of the absence of them, which is that they are natural to women if they are trained in them: if a woman is brought up in modest, decorous ways, there is a natural bias in her to approve of them, to fall into certain habits, to follow certain engaging examples; but if people ever act on the notion that the graces of womanhood are inherent and inalienable, and therefore need not be fostered, they will find themselves mistaken. All education of women, either from neglect or system, which draws them out of the retire-

ment and reserve congenial to what Spenser calls shamefacedness, bears in most cases evident fruit. It is especially the women who have this training in its most flagrant extreme that make the most revolting prisoners; women who, from childhood, have led a public life in streets, and noise, and idleness, and promiscuous association. It is enforced in this work, that the worst and most unmanageable prisoners are not in for the gravest offences. No doubt dread of shame and fear of man have much crime to answer for, as well as such violent passions and vices as are not incompatible with a grave, decorous exterior and decent habits of life; but it is those who have been subject to least discipline, whose womanhood has been least cared for, and with whom the usual safeguards of the sex have been most systematically defied, that supply the class of, not to say, unfeminine, but inhuman prisoners; brought to this pass by audacious disregard of opinion, loss of all self-respect, craving for notoriety, necessity for excitement, intolerance of quiet, and hatred of all steady occupation.

This writer does not assume that, in the worst cases brought under her notice, there have not been better impulses, and memories than found their way to the light, and which might possibly be reached; but of what she has seen she speaks:—

‘But to see some, of these women, hour by hour, and listen to them in their mad defiance, rage, and blasphemy, is almost to believe they are creatures of another mould and race, born with no idea of God’s truth, and destined to die in their own benighted ignorance.

‘As a class, they are desperately wicked; as a class, deceitful, crafty, malicious, lewd, and void of common feeling. With their various temperaments there are various ways of harmonizing them into obedience, and here and there a chance of rousing some little instinct to act and think judiciously; but it can readily be imagined that there are all the vices under the sun exemplified in these hundreds of women, and but a sparse sprinkling of those virtues which should naturally adorn and dignify womanhood. . . . In the penal classes of the male prisons there is not one man to match the worst inmates of our female prisons. There are some women so wholly and entirely bad, that chaplains give up in despair, and prison rules prove failures, and punishment has no effect, save to bring them to “death’s door,” on the threshold of which their guilty tongues still curse and revile; and one must let them have their way, or see them die. There are some women less easy to tame than the creatures of the jungle; and one is almost sceptical of believing that there ever was an innocent childhood or a better life belonging to them. And yet, strange as it may appear, there are few, if any, murderesses among them; they have been chiefly convicted of theft after theft, accompanied by violence, and they are satanically proud of the offences that have brought them within the jurisdiction of the law.

‘In the prison the teaching that should have begun with the women in their girlhood is commenced, and exercises, in a few instances, a salutary influence; but ignorance, deep-besotted ignorance, displays itself with almost every fresh woman on whom the key turns in her cell. It is the great reason for keeping our prisons full, our judges always busy; three-fourths of our prisoners, before their conviction, were unable to read a word; had no knowledge of a Bible, or

what was in it; had never heard of a Saviour; and only remembered God's name as always coupled with a curse. Some women have been trained to be thieves and worse than thieves by their mothers—taking their lessons in crime with a regularity and a persistence that, turned to better things, would have made them loved and honoured all their lives. They have been taught all that is evil, and the evil tree has flourished and borne fruit; it is the hardest task to train so warped and distorted a creation to the right and fitting way. Praise be to those hard-working, unflinching, prison chaplains who strive to their utmost, and are not always unsuccessful.—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 45.

One reason for the pre-eminence in wickedness claimed for these unfortunates is, no doubt, that confinement and compulsory monotonous labour drives them into a sort of frenzy. We can hardly believe that a man is intrinsically better because he takes his punishment with phlegm, and submits to the inevitable, which a different nervous organization chafes against and defies. The great trial to the matrons and everybody connected with the female prisons is the habit of 'breaking out,' as it is called—a fit of mischief which seizes some caged fury, and spreads right and left from cell to cell, wherever the sound of breaking glass and crash of crockery can reach. Hating thought, and yet driven to think in their unaccustomed dreary solitude—hating work, and yet compelled to labour at the needle, or other even more monotonous employment, hour after hour—life becomes unendurable; they must break out; they feel the fit coming; they know the consequences—worse solitude in the dark, and bread and water; but their own interest, their own future of an hour hence is nothing to them, the present is so intolerable, and the present relief of noise and excitement so irresistibly attractive.

'The male prisoners are influenced by some amount of reason and forethought, but the female prisoner flies in the very face of prudence, and acts more often like a mad woman than a rational reflective human being. Those who are cunning enough to carry on by signs and looks, andappings on the wall, a correspondence with their neighbours, are less refractory than those of less experience in evading prison rules. I have known many women, in defiance of a day or two's bread and water, suddenly shout across the airing-yard, or from one cell to another, with a noise all the more vehement for the long restraint to which they have been subjected; and such a proceeding, if remonstrated with, is generally followed by a smashing of windows, and a tearing up of sheets and blankets, that will often affect half a ward with a similar example, if the delinquent is not speedily carried off to refractory quarters.

'It has been long observed that the force of example in the matter of "breakings out" is sure to be strikingly exemplified; that for the sake of change even, and for that excitement which appears to be part of their being, without which they must go melancholy mad, two or three women will, in a quiet aggravating manner, arrange for a systematic smashing of windows and tearing of sheets and blankets.

'I have even known women addressing their matrons in a style similar to the following—

"Miss G——, I'm going to break out to-night."

"Oh, nonsense!—you won't think of any such folly, I'm sure."

'Persuasion is generally attempted first, as a "breaking out" disturbs a whole prison for a day or two.

"I'm sure I shall then."

"What for?"

"Well, I've made up my mind, that's what for. I shall break out to-night—see if I don't."

"Has any one offended you, or said anything?"

"No—no. But I *must* break out. It's so dull here. I'm sure to break out."

"And then you'll go to the "dark."

"I want to go to the 'dark'!" is the answer.

'And the "breaking out" often occurs as promised; and the glass shatters out of the window frames, strips of sheets and blankets are passed through, or left in a heap in the cell, and the guards are sent for, and there is a scuffling and fighting and scratching and screaming that Pandemonium might equal, nothing else.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 52.

This is one form of the malady; but sometimes the practice is fallen into 'on principle,' after a sullen vindictive nursing up of fancied wrong, for the sake of destroying Government property. It is, again, the sign of a violent ebullition of temper; though constantly temper has nothing to do with it, and it is simply entered upon from a craving for change, or, deliberately, for companionship, when it is known the refractory cells are full, and they must be put into them by twos and threes. All excitement is infectious. It is easy to imagine that the impulse for destruction spreads. The love of mischief has some place in all of us; it is only civilization that keeps it down.

'One matron, who has since left the service—a matron of somewhat impulsive disposition—once told me in confidence, and with a comical expression of horror on her countenance, that she was afraid she should break out herself, the temptation appeared so irresistible.

"I have been used to a different sort of life—father, mother, brothers and sisters all around me: light-hearted and happy—that it's like becoming a prisoner oneself to follow this tedious incessant occupation. I assure you, Miss —, that when I hear the glass shattering, and the women screaming, my temples throb, my ears tingle, and I want to break something dreadfully."—*Ibid.* p. 136.

An excitable temperament may well find it difficult to maintain self-control in such scenes; and there are women so 'desperately wicked,' so resolved to resist all efforts to be made anything less abandoned or intemperate than in their first estate, that they will be violent in this way four or five times a week for two months in succession. Indeed, the matron's sufferings from this cause never end till habit acquiesces in them as natural to the scene. Some of the dark cells at Milbank are placed near the matron's sleeping-room, a fact known to the delinquents, whom it animates to fresh exertions of kicking and screaming and singing under the notion of keeping it up while the 'screws are in bed.' Yet in time the matron rises superior to this stroke of malice, and she sleeps through it all—sleeps and dreams of home.

'And amidst it all, and mingling with her dreams, goes the thump, thump, of the prisoners' feet and hands; or wells up from the cell the defiant song of the caged tigress.'—*Ibid.* p. 149.

Of course it must be extremely difficult to find suitable punishment for such offenders, but the writer's experience is against the 'dark;' she does not know of its ever having worked in any single instance a salutary effect upon a prisoner. With the strong it proves their power of tiring out their punishers, with the weak it would soon affect the mind. The grotesque strangely mixes with the horrible in these scenes. One terrible woman sang or rather yelled night and day at the pitch of her voice the burden of a drinking song; another, at stated intervals, uttered a piercing shriek, which for days baffled all attempts to discover its source. A young gipsy girl, one of the worst and most frenzied cases, would spend the time of her incarceration in violent dancing, and kept prisoners and matrons restless with her quick beats on the floor.

'This dance must have been entirely of her own invention, it was so odd and characteristic. There was a peculiar Juba element about it, and a series of rapid, regular beats with the heel and toe alternately, that had a frenzying effect on the listener in the dead of night. Occasionally the night matron (whose office was slowly to pace the wards through the night) would attempt a remonstrance, and Letty would assail her with a torrent of slang and Romany, dancing all the time for fear of throwing herself out of practice. Like most violent women, while the excitement of an outbreak was upon her, she was mad and dangerous. There was no reasoning with her; she had done her worst and been punished to the utmost, and now she would have her "fling," and dance, and sing, and do what she pleased; and if the matron continued remonstrating Letty would fly at the door, and beat it with her fists, and scream.'—*Ibid.* p. 266.

But violence and confinement told upon the gipsy girl, whom one of the matrons remembered a little merry child running wild, and playing antics with her brother on a common. At nineteen all traces of youth had past; she was in for stabbing a man in a brawl, a feat of which she boasted (the well-behaved murderesses are more deliberate in their crime), and was one of the worst women; but with a touch of pride in her royal ancestry, and some family feeling, especially for her brother Vangelo, also 'in trouble.' It is one of the cases where there was even no inherited tradition of home to temper a savage nature. She died in prison, 'untrustworthy and violent to the last,' but least unruly to the matron who remembered her in childhood. On one occasion, however, the 'dark' had real horrors to these wild spirits:—

'It happened that one particular dark cell adjoined a portion of the pentagon belonging to the men's prison, and from this cell issued suddenly the most piteous screams and cries for help. The matron in attendance hurried to the dark, and found the three inmates huddled together, shivering and horrified.

“What is the matter?—what are you calling for?” she inquired.
 “Oh! miss, for the Lord’s sake, let us out! We’ll never break out again—we’ll behave ourselves so well!”

“What is the matter?”
 “Oh! there’s the devil in the next cell behind here. I am sure the devil is coming to fetch us all away! There he is again! Oh! Lord have mercy upon us!”

And sure enough there issued from immediately behind the dark cell a series of the most awful screams and yells that ever escaped human throats. It even alarmed the matron, who was accustomed to these paroxysms of passion; it expressed such fear and horror and agony, and was like no human screaming that had ever been heard in Milbank Prison. A legion of hyenas could not have given vent to a noise more unearthly; and the women added their shrieks to the general tumult, and implored to be released.

A messenger was sent round to the men’s prison to learn the reason for so unusual an occurrence, and presently the mystery was cleared up. Some Chinese prisoners had arrived and had been forced to succumb to the general system of hair-cutting, despite their energetic protests to the contrary. The cherished tails had been unmercifully shorn off amidst the screams of the Chinese; and it was their lamentations over this calamity that had so alarmed the prisoners in the cell adjoining the room wherein the operation had occurred.
 —*Ibid.* p. 152.

It conforms to the notion of possession—of these wretched women not being themselves—that in their fits of fury they have more than the strength of men. Muscularity in its highest development is not a feature of feminine Christianity. No demoniac could surpass the feats of a certain ‘Maria Copes,’ distinguished by especial mention in the report of the directors, ‘whose conduct was so extraordinary and outrageous as to be ‘more that of a wild beast than a reflecting rational human ‘being.’ This woman, in common with many others of this strange sisterhood, is perfectly indifferent to her own sufferings; indeed, the lowest type of criminals often show a different nervous organization, and scarcely feel pain. They will inflict horrible wounds on themselves for the sake of getting into the infirmary. Some will hang themselves, trusting to be cut down in time, with other desperate devices of a similar nature. But the woman in question, from scarcely provoked passion, would go so near killing herself that the authorities were at their wits’ end. She would take ‘headers’ against a stone wall, or bring her head in contact with it by a series of rolling swings, till the sound of the successive cracks sickened every bystander. She would bite off her handcuffs, and liberate herself from every contrivance to restrain her movements; pull up the flooring, wrench doors off their hinges, and disfigure the padded room with her teeth. It is curious that this woman never uttered an oath the whole time she was in prison, the body was her sole engine of mischief. Another thing to remark is that this prodigious power was kept up without exercise. She would not walk or go into the air, and any attempt to force her resulted

in a scene. The doctors, after a solemn sitting, pronounced this wild creature in perfectly sound mind; but the distinction between such a state—and it is only an extreme of a not uncommon condition in female prisoners—and madness must be a very subtle one. Indeed, we cannot read these records without speculating on the various degrees of responsibility among what are called rational beings. In the same class, though far worse than this ‘agile panther,’ as she is called, are other women here shown us; but like her in the wild indifference to their own well-being and in the grotesque animal form of vice they present. They stand out embodiments of gigantic evils, of which society is dimly conscious. What must be the condition of whole classes which can produce these portents? A certain ‘Towers, with a disproportionate revolting countenance, a ‘cripple, white faced, and with black eyes that made one shudder,’ makes the reader shudder too. She was so wicked that even the prisoners were horrified at her. ‘She’s like the devil hisself, isn’t she, miss?’ said one of them, herself not noted for good behaviour. This woman resolutely kept to her bed.

‘Blaspheming and singing were her two principal employments; if needlework were given her, she would tear her work to pieces and swallow her needle to horrify the matron. She was taken to the refractory cell at times, but her crippled condition rendered her transfer thence an almost instantaneous process; and her schemes for removal and self-damage were horribly ingenious. She was partial to secreting a piece of glass about her clothing, opening her veins with it, and allowing them to bleed silently, giving no hint of what she had done. It was only her gradual faintness that gave the alarm, and brought relief to her, otherwise she would have bled stoically to death in her bed; and this not once nor twice, but in a general way, however closely watched. . . . By some mystery never solvable by prison vigilance, the glass or the pebble was always available and ready to be produced from her bed, or pillow, or even her back hair, for the horrible gash which blanched the face of her watchers. If she was anxious to proceed to the infirmary, some such scheme she would always adopt, despite the vigilance of her officers, till her life was despaired of. Towers always rallied, however, and allowed herself sufficient time to recover some of her old strength, before, in a business-like manner, she would proceed to hack at her veins again. By way of change she would sometimes powder the glass and swallow it, and bring on internal hemorrhage—a practice adopted by more than one prisoner at both Milbank and Brixton. . . . Sometimes she would lie in bed, and scream for help, till assistance arrived, when she would struggle into a sitting posture, and fling every available utensil at the light, or the heads of the officers—she was not particular—accompanying every effort at damage by an oath, or an expression that made the blood run cold.’ —*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 286.

Another of these miserable and abandoned creatures, whose hatred and malignity overflowed upon themselves, persisted in remaining in the dark. ‘The dark suited her;’ and she threatened to break out or attempt some one’s life if she was thwarted. There she remained, day after day, refusing all persuasion and every inducement to return to prison duties.

'The matron in attendance had a favourite little kitten which was accustomed to follow her about the wards; and it chanced that on opening the door to attend to this woman, the kitten concealed itself in the cell, and was locked up with the prisoner.

'This feline intruder would have been hailed a welcome guest by most women under the same circumstances; but this prisoner had never shown an instance of affection for any living thing within the prison walls. The kitten was missed, and search was made for it—the woman in the dark cell had seen nothing of it. "What made any one think she knew about the kitten?" The cell was opened, and the little kitten found suffocated by the prisoner. "That's how I should like to serve the whole of you," she growled. . . . Actions that would give pain to others were Honor Matthew's chief satisfaction. She passed from prison without a hope that one good light had been born within her during a long period of incarceration.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 155; ii. p. 281.

Self-preservation and self-love are, we are accustomed to think, so inseparable from rational nature, that a uniform long-continued deliberate disregard of them is scarcely compatible with sanity. But these mysteries of malignity overmastering all material pleasures and desires are, perhaps, scarcely profitable subjects of speculation: still, ignorance and the frenzied impatience of a wild nature at reproof, restraint, and punishment, do seem to interfere in these cases with responsibility.

This lady's examples, however, are not confined to such witch-like perversions of nature; such self-tormenting selfishness. All ordinary human weaknesses have their place in the prison cell. She assures us that, as a class, these women are inordinately vain. Women so dead to self-respect that they do not care in what depths of degradation all the world sees them, are yet the slaves of personal vanity, and will resort to the most ludicrous means of gratifying it. Condemned to the company of their own sex, and to a costume the least gratifying to a gaudy taste, the passion for ornament, fashion, and colour will crop out, and find indulgence too. The first cruel blow to a female convict's pride is inflicted on her entrance into the prison. The hair is cut off; there is something pathetic in the universal recoil from this indignity, which, however necessary and merited, is yet an aggression on 'nature itself.'

'Women whose hearts have not quailed, perhaps, at the murder of their infants, or the poisoning of their husbands, clasp their hands in horror at this sacrifice of their natural adornment—weep, beg, pray, occasionally assume a defiant attitude and resist to the last, and are finally only overcome by force. It is one of the most painful tasks of the prison, this hair-cutting operation—moreover, it is, in my opinion, at least, a test of character.

'One woman will be resigned to her fate on the instant, and, with a Socratic stoicism, will compress her lips and submit herself to the shears, and march away to her bath afterwards in a business-like manner; a second will have a shivering fit over it; a third will weep passionately; and a fourth will pray to be spared the indignity, and implore the matron on her knees to go to the lady superintendent and state her case to her. . . . I can remember one prisoner delirious for a day and night after the operation. She was a young

fair Scotch girl, and her "Dinna cut my hair; oh! dinna cut my hair!" rang along the deserted corridors with a plaintive earnestness.

Some struggle and swear, others coax, and others stoutly maintain that their hair is their husbands' and the illegality of touching it. In some she thinks the operation produces permanent effects on the temper. But, shorn as it is, it still continues an object of solicitude to the prisoner, increasing with its growth. The author describes a night scene in Milbank prison, when a 'poor delicate woman' begged to speak a word with her as she passed, candlestick in hand, towards her room:—

"Lord bless you, miss!" observed the woman; "I'm so glad to see you to-night—I've something on my mind."

"You must not talk, you'll disturb the other women."

"I'll only whisper it—if you won't mind just a word, miss."

"Just a word" is a great boon—an everlasting favour conferred—with the more grateful of this class, and I went nearer the grating to hear her statement. She began in a low and lachrymose voice, intended to arouse my sympathy and interest in her coming revelation, and then suddenly darted a long naked arm through the grating, and hooked some of the melted tallow from the candle in my hand.

"It's on'y jist a scrap of tallow for my hair, miss," said she, applying it to her hair very rapidly with both hands; "it do get awful rough without fat, to be sure! And I'm very much obliged to you, miss. Good night."

"And, with a triumphant laugh at her own adroitness, the woman darted from the grating into her bed, where I heard her chuckling to herself over her success as I went down the ward to my room."—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 111.

To superior intelligences the wiles of diplomatists, the intrigues of power, the master strokes of Machiavellian dissimulation, may possibly make the same figure as this successful and really ingenious *ruse* does to ourselves. We are forced to admire the resources of a ruling passion under difficulties which almost amount to a disability. Some women extract a rouge out of the red line in the cheek shirting they are employed upon, and whiten the skin from the whitewashed walls. A certain handsome termagant showed an incorrigible taste for style, and gave even prison garments an air, 'turning all the women's minds' by her expedients for 'bandoline' and the art with which she twisted the most unaccommodating material into graceful lines and flowing skirts, compressing her waist to fainting with the wire grating of her window, and her turning the rope and sheets of her bedding into crinoline. Nor was it safe to be too austere upon these manœuvres, as they were found some corrective to a fiendish temper; and, in fact, a woman condemned to a hideous uniform, and cut off from every exercise of freewill in her adornment, unless she is *more* than woman, will certainly become less than one. We doubt if the worst of these convicts do not resume some of the attributes of their sex with their outer-air attire. Some satisfaction

in their personal *tout ensemble* is, perhaps, the nearest point they can attain to self-respect. In their most frenzied escapades they probably never lose the sense of acting in disguise; a woman in a prison uniform is, we feel as we look at her, not herself.

But the refractory, to whom prison is intolerable, are only one side of the picture. In contrast to them are others who seem to find in its stern uniformity a repose almost conventual—women submitting to every rule, liking the monotony, the silence, the compulsion; who love their cell as many a nun has done hers, and for perhaps much the same reason. There are people, in fact, everywhere who, wherever they live, contrive to confine their actual interests within a few narrow walls, and see, hear, and feel for nothing beyond. The most curious example of this content is in the case of two women, mother and daughter, guilty of manslaughter, for having starved to death their respective daughter and sister. It was quite certain that they were guilty, yet the writer attributes the crime more to a certain ‘unimpressibility’—a dull want of feeling and observation—than to any direct cruelty or malice. It looks like a natural deterioration, the result of poverty and short commons, starving ‘the genial current of the soul.’ In prison they at once nestled into their place; the dull, dead neatness and order, the serenity, the absence of all fret and anxiety about a living, the still recurring meals much better and fuller than they had known before, made up all they could care for of life.

They arrived two pitiable, emaciated creatures, with whom existence had hitherto been a struggle, and, under prison diet, gained health and vigour. Placed in separate cells, it was supposed that they would be solicitous about each other, and information was volunteered.

“Don’t you wish to hear how your daughter is getting on?” was asked of the elder Garnett one day.

“She’s getting on very well,” answered the mother; “she be a quiet girl, and no trouble to you I’m sure, lady.”

“Not much trouble, certainly.”

On the same question being put to the daughter respecting the mother, she looked quietly from her coir-picking, and hoped mother had not been fidgetting.’
—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 72.

The matrons could not believe in the coolness of their interest in each other, and, considering their excellent conduct, brought about a meeting, appointing both at once to some kitchen service, performed by the prisoners. The scene precisely resembled what we have seen between tortoises first introduced to their own kind:—

‘It was not intended that any conversation should ensue between them, but it was thought that there would be a pleasant satisfaction to both in their silent meeting, the remembrance of which would help to lighten their solitary

labours. The result was a failure. The coldest and most unconcerned of glances passed between mother and daughter, one slight stare, and then an assiduous devotion to their present duties; and never a second look from one to another; on the contrary, the most perfect ignoring of one another's presence. They went on their separate tasks in the old icy fashion, and showed no sign of any mental disturbance during that day, or even alluded to the circumstance of their meeting.—*Ibid.* p. 74.

In fact, they were naturally in that condition of mind towards each other which extreme monastic austerity enforces as the highest perfection. On one occasion, the elder looked abstracted, and was supposed to be in trouble of mind. She was asked if she wished for anything:—

“Oh! no, lady,” she replied.

“I thought you were dull.”

“I’m very comfortable, thank you.”

“You are not fretting about the length of your sentence?”

“I’ve nothing to fret about, lady; I’m better off here than ever I was in —shire. We were all starving together there; and my husband, who was a shepherd, was very ill, and my daughter was weak too, and we had nothing to give them—nothing at all to give them, or ourselves. And so my daughter died. But, lady, it was not in our power to help her.”—*Ibid.* p. 76.

This was the only plea of innocence she ever made, and in distinction to the protestations she was in the habit of hearing, the writer was disposed to believe it. After a time, ‘they worked their way to association,’ as a reward for good and ‘religious’ conduct, and the mother and daughter were placed together:—

‘Their first meeting was after the old apathetic fashion.

“Well, Elizabeth?”

“Well, mother?”

‘They were seated opposite each other at the table two minutes after their meeting, working—silently and monotonously. There appeared to be no subject between them on which they cared to converse; they took up their new position without any display of feeling, just as if it was a prison rule to which they were compelled to conform, and had no particular objection.

‘After a week’s association, a matron asked the daughter whether she was not glad to have her mother as a companion.

“Ye’es, lady,” was the hesitating answer; “it’s a kind of change, but”—with a little impulsive dash—“she do make a great mess and litter, to be sure!”—*Ibid.* p. 77.

Nor is it only to stolid temperaments that prison life is attractive. As a class, this writer says, the prisoners are not unhappy. The diet at Milbank and Brixton is better than in our workhouses; the treatment, she is ready to say, more kind and sympathising; and the monotony of employment, where it does not exasperate, soothes and quiets. She gives an interview between a young convict and her honest mother, in which the old woman complains of poverty at home, and looks forward to ‘the house’ as her refuge. ‘Don’t go into the house,’ says the prisoner. ‘What can I do, dear?’ replies the mother.

'Come here,' is the reply, the daughter going on to prove how much better off she will be in gaol; that she will have no hard words, enough to eat and drink; such blankets and sheets to lie on! and the doctor every day, if she likes; and 'it's like heaven in the infirmary.' And proceeding to show—till checked by the matron in attendance—how the thing could be managed. There is quite an engaging account of one old woman of seventy, who had grown into prison life and could fancy no other; 'a quiet, meek, obedient prisoner, truthful, reading her Bible without parade, and a communicant;' proud of still being able to do her stroke of allotted work, and making her age no excuse to evade it; keeping her cell a pattern of neatness, calling it her 'little room,' and feeling it her only home. It is naturally a matter of inquiry how this virtuous matron reconciled to her conscience the crime necessary to secure to herself this asylum in perpetuity. When the end of the term for her first offence drew near, she felt the difficulty herself:—

"I don't know what I shall do when my time's up," she said to me once; "there's no one to take care of me outside, and I'm afraid they'll treat me very badly at the workhouse. Well, I suppose, miss, I must make the best of it."—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 193.

She evidently dreaded the loss of respect to which she was accustomed; besides, she liked the chaplain, and would miss his ministrations, therefore clinging to the idea of coming back again—

"I'll try the workhouse," was her remark one day, "but I'm thinking it won't suit me like this—not half so comfortable and quiet."

In this frame the 'cheerful, feeble old woman' passed out into the world:—

'But in a few months she reappeared at Milbank prison. Old Mary Collis had been convicted of a petty theft again, and was sentenced to a second term of imprisonment.

"I have come back to settle down for good," she said. "I know I've done very wrong, and that I'm old enough to know what's right by this time, but *I couldn't keep away!* I have tried the workhouse; they're so terribly noisy there, and there's not half the order there should be, and everybody wants to quarrel so. "Besides," she added, with characteristic naïveté, "they don't understand my ways at the workhouse, and you are all so used to me by this time." . . . She fell into the same old habits—read her Bible as industriously as ever, took the Sacrament, preserved ever the same good temper, and *did* die before her term of imprisonment was ended. . . . A good prisoner, and as good a Christian as it was possible for a prisoner to be perhaps. She died, I think, at the age of seventy-six, in the infirmary ward of Brixton prison."—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 193.

Another model prisoner of this class was, strange to say, a murderess—a life prisoner for poisoning her husband. She denied the crime, 'but there was no breaking through the circumstantial evidence,' though it was difficult for even a 'prison

matron' to reconcile the charge with her appearance and conduct. A woman with a kind motherly face, 'nearly bent double, and leaning on a stick,' that one took naturally to, 'and whom the prisoners called "mother,"' by consent:—

"Oh, isn't she like the mother I ran away from, twenty years ago?" a prisoner cried once, with a little shudder; "I wish they'd put her somewhere else than near me!" And again, when she was sent home to die. "She was just like a mother to us," one remarked. "A blessed sight better mother than ever I had the luck of," was the reply.—*Ibid.* p. 266.

It disturbs all our ideas that the magnitude of the crime should be so fallacious an index of the conduct; but, as we have said, the everyday habits of the past life seem rather to regulate prison morality than individual acts of any kind. There are people whom prison frenzies, some few whom it sobers and refines, while it leaves no scope for their besetting temptations. One may note here, too, that within the prison walls public opinion seems to make few distinctions. We do not gather that the prisoners express horror at each other's crimes; and it is next to impossible for the officers to measure the characters of those under their care by any abstract standard. They must speak as they find. Whatever a person has done before they entered these walls, submission, decency, and good temper are paramount claims to a lenient judgment. A murderess, who behaves herself, is not pointed at, or shuddered at, as she would be out of doors. In some cases our prison matron is disposed to trace the act so much at variance with the seeming character to incipient insanity, and Celestina Sommer, who finished her life in the criminal lunatic asylum, is, for the atrocity of her crime, a notorious example in point. Where a dread of shame leads to the act, this solution is not called for. The character of a certain Elizabeth Harris, guilty of the cold-blooded murder of two children, leads to the following remarks:—

'She was another of those women who, in captivity for crimes of the deepest dye, became the most quiet and best behaved of prisoners. As a rule, murderesses are the women most apt to conform to prison discipline, most anxious to gain the goodwill of their officers, and easily swayed by a kind word. They are not generally of the lowest grade—that is, not the most illiterate and mentally depraved.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 259.

And again—

'Women who are in for murder, more especially the murder of their children, are, as a rule, the best behaved, and the most light-hearted of prisoners.'—*Ibid.* p. 84.

And this leads to another observation concerning this class of criminals; and, indeed, the light in which crime is viewed generally by prisoners. Amongst bad and good indiscriminately, we can see scarcely a trace of real repentance, or even remorse. They uniformly seem to accept the punishment as plenary

absolution; even if the more thoughtful and decent see the harm of what they have done, and recognise the duty of admitting their guilt. We cannot but suppose that, in the case of some of these women guilty of murder, if their crime had never been found out, they would have suffered agonies of remorse—possibly even made confession; but *conviction* and *punishment* seem in all cases to stand for confession and absolution; there are no traces of an uneasy conscience. Now and then, very rarely, a depressed manner leads to the surmise that thoughts may be passing within, but, whatever the chaplain may hear, the matron, at least, is not made the confidant of broken-hearted self-reproach. She speaks of the awful rule of ‘non-repentance,’ and again—

‘It is a remarkable fact that, with most female convicts, the sentence is considered a fair equivalent for the act committed, and they think there is no further occasion to trouble their heads about the matter. “The deed is done,” and prison life is penance and absolution for it. Elizabeth Harris, who had deliberately drowned her two children, was ever a cheerful woman, possessing a brisk step and a bright smile.’—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 164.

With Sarah Baker, who had thrown her baby down a pit-shaft:—

‘The past crime did not press heavily on her conscience; I have observed, but it is a remarkable fact, that these serious acts seldom do. . . . I may add here that with all the prisoners the crime is of little account, and the sentence for it only a thing to be deplored.’

Does remorse, then, mean in most cases dread of discovery? It would seem so. It is the weight of a secret—not only fear of punishment, but the burden of a mystery which human nature cannot bear. It is conscience convicting us of having sinned against human judgment and feeling; it is the horror of what men will say. When man knows and has done his worst, this aspect of conscience is at rest, though there is no repentance; though the sin is not mourned for, and there is no thought even of the Divine Judge.

The chaplain, she admits, hears words of contrition and resolutions of amendment, but people in scenes like these are mainly, though not always reasonably, guided by their personal observation and experience. In one case she mentions the deep and vivid effect of a rousing sermon on that most favourite of all occasions for popular emotion, a funeral sermon:—

‘That the chaplain’s exhortations, for the most part, have little effect, may be readily imagined from the character of the congregation; but still, here and there, the good seed falls at times and bears some fruit, and preaching is not always a ceremony, even in prisons, that is dry and unprofitable and disheartening. . . . It happened that Julia McCoy, one of the prisoners, had died the previous week; and the minister, who chanced at that time to be officiating, took advantage of the occasion to speak of her death and of the circumstances connected with it, in simple, earnest language that struck home

to those stubborn hearts, and brought tears into all eyes. It was an affecting sight; here were women, whose whole term of confinement had been an outrage against common sense and propriety, making the chapel echo with their stifled sobs; there were women who had not shrunk at murder, infanticide, and all the crimes that degrade our poor humanity, weeping like children at the thought of their fellow-prisoner's natural death. The subject was well chosen, skilfully handled, and the right chord had been struck; there were purer, better thoughts rising from the depths that morning than it was ever guessed could have life amid such darkness.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 250.

This is pleasant to read; and good thoughts have an influence independent, perhaps, of their immediate, perhaps physical effects; but the sequel to this scene is curious. Something of the kind, no doubt, may often be observed after religious excitement, on its more undisciplined, unrestrained subjects:—

'But still, one sermon will not regenerate a prison; and though some good possibly followed it, yet I cannot honestly aver that there was much sign of general amendment. Some of the women were even so unsettled as to "break out" shortly afterwards; the new thoughts troubled them, and they must shake them off or go mad. Better back to the old life than to be troubled with *them*; and so the glass was crashing in the wards again, and the dark cells were once more full of inmates.'

Thought, as such, is horrible to these poor creatures, and no doubt dimly full of fears. Even their compulsory schooling drives the more densely ignorant wild:—'I can't stand it, miss,' one exclaimed; 'it only drives me silly. I'm sick of schooling; you'd better take me back to my cell, I shall only make a row here. Don't say I have not given you warning.'—P. 251.

It is remarked, however, that something of benignant Sunday influence is to be found even in a prison, some little respect for the Sabbath by the most obstinate prisoners:—

'It has struck me more than once that the best women—the good-conduct women of all classes—are often grave and thoughtful (on Sunday). Now and then a matron, suddenly entering a cell, may find a prisoner in tears; and it is always a prisoner who has had some semblance of a home in early days, or some well-meaning father or mother.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 254.

The instances of insubordination are less on Sunday than on any other day throughout the year; while, on the contrary, the Christmas season—no doubt, in days of liberty, always profaned by some greater excess of riot—was found a period of especial turbulence. In fact, prison is a place to show the supremacy of habit. We are all of us weak against temptation, but the habit of non-resistance in these wild natures turns temptation into a sort of law. 'You see, miss, I did try very hard, but it *wasn't* to be,' said one of them on her re-commitment; 'I was obliged to steal; I did try my best, but it couldn't be helped, and here I am. It wasn't my fault exactly, because I *did* try, you see, miss;' and this is called 'the common excuse'—a woman always asserts that it was not to be avoided. And there are one or two melancholy instances of women

entering upon a new and creditable mode of life relapsing, not without agony of mind, at the first word from an old intimate, or 'pal,' as a convict friend is always called. The slang epithet would not be misapplied to many a so-called friendship out of prison walls, wherever there is intimacy without respect, or regard, or confidence. Where all these are wanting, the necessity for companionship makes the 'pal' a very important need. The first term of imprisonment is one of solitude; it is only at rare intervals that association is allowed. After a time, two are placed together, and at Brixton the solitary system is not at all observed. But no restraint can prevent partial intercourse; the freemasonry of prisoners is a mystery which cannot be got at. They contrive means of communication, written and by signs, in their dreary single file promenades. They even converse and concoct schemes of rebellion by silent movements of the lips from opposite galleries of the chapel, which, from various indications, must be a strange theatre for prison tactics; disorder, under the mask of an exact conformity, presenting in startling parable, what may be the contrast between seeming and reality amongst many a free congregation, if wandering thoughts and rebellious attention could make themselves heard and seen by the senses. No woman will make her 'pal' a confidant of any good thoughts or softening of heart; all this is for the matron. No doubt it would be regarded as meanness, as a giving in, by a society which has respect for no other quality but daring audacity, and which supports the spirit by recollections of past feats and schemes for future mischief. Yet, though there is not much love in these alliances, there is a great deal of jealousy. Nothing is more curious and noteworthy than the influence of this passion in these narrow, selfish minds. Indeed, it is a scene to show us the anatomy of all the vices, amongst ourselves decently skinned over. With us jealousy may be even attractive as the morbid working of a too deep and concentrated affection; but nothing can be said for the envious discontent which will keep a woman brooding, scowling, and sullen for days, because a favourite matron has spoken a word of kindness to a fellow-prisoner, grudging another any share of a tenderness which has no value to her but as being exclusive. Yet, perhaps, as a sign of some feeling, it is better than mere indifference.

On this head of sentiment there is one curious feature which may illustrate the natural history of crime, though we can see no connexion between an innocent propensity and an inherent tendency to deceit. Those who have read Mr. Wilkie Collins' last novel will remember the amiable villain Fosco (the best character by far in the story) and his pet canaries. The two

female swindlers in this book show the same turn for taming animals, and the same strange fascination over them. A woman who had used her lady-like manners to defraud innumerable shopkeepers, and who in prison had capabilities of 'talking over totally out of the common,' established a friendship with a mouse, which she tamed to the most perfect subservience, bestowing on it that exclusive affection which natures cold towards their own kind sometimes bestow on animals. In the case of this woman, her contempt for her fellow-prisoners met with a repulsive rough revenge, for one of them got into her cell in her absence and bit off her friend's tail. The other case of this tendency was in Alice Grey, whom our readers may remember as 'the fascinating Alice Grey,' as she loved to call herself, who perpetrated so many feats of swindling, perjury, and false accusation. This woman showed no spark of interest for any human being during her imprisonment, but became passionately fond of a sparrow, which she would sing and talk to in a simple artless way, wholly at variance with her manner to her fellow-men. The bird seemed to exercise a salutary influence over her, for, when it was lost, she degenerated, became violent and fierce, and her fine manners, which could at any time give place to the lowest scurrility of language, seemed to desert her. Instances of more wholesome feeling are not wanting in these annals. Few women are without something of the mother's instinct, and are kind in their way to their children born in the prison, of whom there are not a few; but beyond this, they are not without some sense of the sanctity of childhood, however wickedly, in many instances, this is violated. Mention is made of one child-prisoner, apparently only ten years, a pretty little girl, on whom the prison garments hung loose and incongruous. At first sight of her, at the first shock of the contrast between the look of innocence and the place—

'Women looked from one to another, wringing their hands and compressing their lips together; one woman clasped her hands instinctively, and cried, "My God, look here!" and presently there was a deep convulsive sob escaping on all sides. "It's a shame—it's an awful shame!—she shouldn't have come here!" more than one woman ventured to exclaim; and it became necessary to pass Lydia Camblin to her cell as quickly as possible, in order to calm the excitement of the women.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 179.

The child herself, however, too well fitted her new sphere, and might, we are told, have been 'an old prison bird of forty years of age for her coolness, presence of mind, craft,' and general delinquency. Another trait of feeling is more remarkable still in such a place, and impresses us very painfully with the thought how much poetry and sentiment may lie hid and overlaid in these outcasts of society, exposed to so few bright and pure influences. One suffering common to all these women is

the absence of anything to please the taste. They evidently hunger for some gratification to the eye, will tear out the pictures from the library books to stick them on their cell walls, though but for an hour or two; and will infringe the rules by snatching at the few and homely flowers in the airing-ground, which, when secured, become such objects of envy and contention, that the theft is immediately discovered:—

‘I have a remembrance of looking through the “inspection” of a cell some years ago, and perceiving a prisoner, with her elbows on the table, staring at a common daisy, which she had plucked from the central patch of grass during her rounds—one of those rude, repulsive, yet not wholly bad prisoners, from whom no display of sentiment was anticipated. Yet the wistful look of that woman at her stolen prize was a gleam of as true sentiment as ever breathed in a poet’s lines. A painter might have made much of her position, and a philosopher might have moralised concerning it; for the woman wept at last, dropped her head down on the table between her clasped hands, and shed her bitter tears silently and noiselessly.’—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 103.

Nor are our sympathies only awakened by the transient regrets and pathetic sorrows of these poor creatures; some of their pleasures, rare, chance, and only what are inevitable, awake a strong fellow-feeling. This clear and lively writer brings before us some pleasant glimpses in the description of the matron’s ‘escort’ of prisoners from one place to another. The peep at the outer world from their omnibus is full of delight to these women, by no means so burdened by a sense of shame or guilt as not to be open to every pleasant impression, every suggestive sight. And they are able to express their thoughts. The reputed talk of these women gives us no mean idea of their intellect and power of expression, though probably it is only the more acute whose talk is fluent and connected enough, and their thoughts sufficiently distinct, to be committed to memory. Thus, as they drive through the streets, the size of everything fills their minds:—

“‘Everything looks so large, miss,” was the remark of one woman to the matron; “it isn’t like the streets and houses somehow, it’s something new and big.”

‘And this impression seems conveyed to the minds of most women. What a large dog!—what a large house!—what large gardens to all the forecourts! It almost appears as if ten or twelve months’ confinement to a narrow cell had diminished their power of comparison, and narrowed their busy plotting minds.

‘Spasmodic observations on the passers-by are not unfrequent, despite all efforts to keep silence. “That’s like my brother Jack! That’s like my mother!”

‘At the corner of the Vauxhall Bridge Road, before the railway arch is passed under, and the Vauxhall station passed, there is an evident anxiety to see the shops amongst the London-bred girls—it’s so like old times to see the shops. Women will slyly turn round in their seats, or lean over their fellow-prisoners, to look at the play-bills before the doors of the tobacconists.

“‘I wonder what’s out now at the Vic. or the Surrey? Oh, what treats I have had there!” a woman once sighed in confidence to her neighbour. “Weren’t they jolly nights up in the gallery at Christmas time?” “Ah! it

was all along o' the play I ever came here!" I heard a woman mutter in response.

'It's always along o' something—the play, the concert-room, the streets, the false friend who tried to lead her wrong, and she so innocent!—the bad advisers, the cruel mother, father, husband, anybody—never her own weakness, or headlong desperate plunge to ruin.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 7.

Then come the suburbs, the flowers, the peep at the river, with the steamers, the barges, the boats flashing on the water—and the rapturous exclamation, 'Isn't this first-rate! and they're all at chapel now at Brixton.' Alas! that there are any excluded from these common joys, that it is necessary to shut out some while they live from all the eye craves for, forcing thought and memory to feed upon themselves. What have we done that in contrast with these cold privations the vast world of eye and ear in their immense variety and beauty should be open to us at our will, too familiar to be valued, too accessible at all times to tempt us to the trouble of enjoying them in all their fulness?

Thus it is. We cannot write or read of men and women, whatever they are, however deeply they have sunk, but we come to pity and to feel for them at last. This very intelligent observer certainly set about detailing her experience with no romantic intention of engaging our interest in criminals and their crimes. She has found the criminals too repulsive, too ungrateful, too hopelessly weak, too willing slaves, and their passions too troublesome and exasperating, perhaps, for her to entertain other than the most orthodox and anti-French notions on the loathsomeness of evil. But it is impossible, writing in a candid and good spirit, not to temper the harsh picture with some warm, kindly touches, forcing on us such a sense of kindred that we cannot recoil from the worst without a sense of compassion, and a thankful recognition of the safeguards which have surrounded us from childhood to maturity, and never once allowed us to come in contact with the form of temptation under which they have fallen.

One instance we are tempted to give of the inequality of punishment for the same offence which in *this* world is permitted. It is in the case of one of the worst and most violent women in the prison, who had been brought up virtuously and respectably, but had possessed the fatal gift of beauty, which had attracted a young college student in his summer excursion. At the time of this incident her health was suffering from her own frenzied insubordination, and the door of her cell was permitted to be open for more air, the entrance being secured by a grating.

'One day visitors were expected in the prison; when they arrived, they were escorted round the wards in the usual manner. The gentlemen were more interested in minor details than strangers on a visit to our Government establishments usually are. In due course, the ward wherein Jane Ellis (the name

is a feigned one) was confined was reached. Glancing towards her cell, and perceiving that only one door was secured in lieu of two, an inquiry was made as to the reason of that cell's being more open than the rest. Suddenly there was a strange silence—a silence that struck even the matron of the ward with surprise—and the inquiring visitor stood, as rigid as a statue, staring at a face white as death, that glared back at him through the iron grating.

"The visitor moved on, asked if the woman were seriously ill, the nature of her sentence, &c., and then passed on his tour of inspection, and left the prison shortly afterwards. Presently it was noticed that Ellis was still standing at the grated door, as though she had been turned to stone.

"What is the matter, Ellis?" asked her matron.

"Who was that man? What was his name?"

"I do not know. I have not heard."

"Did you see him look at me?"

"The matron could but answer in the affirmative.

"Oh, my God, well he might! Miss —," she cried in a stifled whisper, "as God's my judge, that was the man who led me first to ruin. Before I knew him, I was an innocent girl."—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 226.

The man had had a hundred ways of retrieving himself; the woman had slid from bad to worse till she was now an object from which he would recoil with virtuous antipathy. From the story we may infer that *neither* had repented. Yet the difference now was that she was a bad and infamous woman, he a 'respectable' man. Such differences are not, however, what they *seem*. It may after all bear analogy with the difference between male and female convicts, the former of whom are reasonable by contrast, and much more manageable and tractable as prisoners. Yet if we can judge by the indignant reports of those now opposing the ticket-of-leave system, their reason which has helped these men to obtain a commutation of punishment does not hinder their returning to the old villanous mode of life more a child of hell than before.

On this question of tickets-of-leave our authoress is disposed to speak in favour of them, though she throws some discredit on the official statistics proving the success of the system by calling attention to the fact that licensed female convicts are not unfrequently reconvicted under a new name, a change not discovered till they have passed through all formal entries in the prison books. Since, however, women are apt to show their real character with little attempt at reserve or self-restraint, good conduct in prison may be a higher test in their case, and be worth more than where there is a man's deliberate forethought and resolution to bide his time. In *his* case, at any rate, experience seems to show that justice had better be allowed to take its course, and that he himself is seldom a real gainer by an indulgence which exposes the innocent to such formidable risks.

ART. VI.—*The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon: including all his Occasional Works—namely, Letters, Speeches, Tracts, State-papers, Memorials, Devices—and all authentic Writings not already printed among his Philosophical, Literary, or Professional Works. Newly collected and set forth in Chronological Order, with a Commentary Biographical and Historical.* By JAMES SPEDDING. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts. 1861, 1862.

THE world has long had a particular view on the subject as well of Lord Bacon's character as of his genius. It is now asked to correct its estimate of the one by its convictions as to the other. The world is, no doubt, in error about a large number of things, and is guilty of not being always very ready to be set right; but it should be clearly understood, that the burden of proof lies entirely on those who maintain the novel conclusion. It cannot be enough for them to say that as much is to be alleged on their side of the question as on the other; they must allege very much more. And this, not because facts against a man's character are more cogent than others in his favour, but for the reason that it must be assumed—that much of the evidence on which men condemned the historical character has now been lost, the judgment having rendered its preservation needless, while the testimony on the adverse side has been kept alive on the chance of a future appeal from the decision.

The new version of our greatest philosopher's case has lately been argued by two advocates—ingeniously by Mr. Hepworth Dixon, and gravely and learnedly by Mr. Spedding. The arguments of the latter writer are more likely to carry weight with them, from the circumstance that their author does not propose any fixed object of attack, but, in the ordinary course of research, seems to come undesignedly on views and proofs militating with the received popular belief. But, while we allow all due praise to the care and thoughtfulness with which the facts have been marshalled, we cannot allow that the general belief ought to be reversed. As often, the world may have been wrong in its premisses, but in its conclusion it has been substantially right. It has with truth condemned Bacon for selfishness, but has perhaps erred in attempting to demonstrate this by almost exclusive reference to the part he acted against the Earl of Essex. It has rightly branded him, in that he, being the greatest master of abstract truth—a very lord of

nature's secrets, paid servile homage to court favourites and court corruption; and yet, while correctly in this estimating the laxness of his principles, it has certainly tarnished the lustre of its judgment by indorsing a special persecution directed for his downfall, by fair means or foul, by the very creatures subservience to whom is the main article of impeachment against his nobility of mind.

As has been, and, from the nature of the case, must always be, the result of a careful and minute investigation into the life and genius of one, beyond controversy, admirable in some respects, Mr. Spedding seems to us to have become acclimatised to his hero's failings both of morality and of fortune, and to have called up in his behalf a pleasant chimera, not merely of the Cecils' mean jealousy where none perhaps existed, but even of high promotion narrowly lost, where really the subject of the biography was hardly ranked as a competitor. Thus, in respect of the vacant posts of Attorney and Solicitor General, and, subsequently, of the Rolls, he writes as though Bacon both deserved and nearly attained one of the highest elevations in the law. For a whole year, the Attorney-Generalship, vacated by Egerton, was not filled up. Coke was certainly a candidate for the honour; and the Earl of Essex boldly maintained the pretensions to the same office of his friend Francis Bacon. So much may be acknowledged on both sides; but the assumption, made with the most undoubting confidence by Mr. Spedding, that the contest lay actually between the greatest lawyer of the age and the young genius whose fee-book was all but blank, must astonish a logical reader. Mr. Spedding imagines a whole phalanx of doubts springing up in the minds of Queen Elizabeth and Lord Burleigh—doubts between the too free and independent character of the minister's nephew and the same man's acknowledged legal acumen and experience. At last the balance inclines against his claims; the patrons of the office are supposed almost to confess his right to the preferment, but to be unable to forget their anger at his financial opposition in the Commons. Coke is named Attorney, but only as a last resource. Bacon meets with the fate of a Tory patriarch of the law, postponed by a Liberal Government to a Whig *parvenu*, or the converse case.

The same assumption we see in full force and vigour dominating over our author's imagination in relation to the Solicitorship, which Coke's *paradoxical* promotion had left unoccupied. The argument now is, that it was strange indeed that Bacon could be left unprovided for, when his claims to elevation were so clear as, notwithstanding his temporary unpopularity at court, to keep the Attorney's post from being filled during

twelve months. Poor Serjeant Fleming, whose name still pervades the limbo of old reports as that of a profound lawyer of the old stamp, is regarded by the biographer as no stumbling-block in the way of Bacon, had Bacon not made his famous subsidy speech. But all this appears to us somewhat fanciful, though more particularly so, so far as it relates to the higher of the two appointments. Mr. Spedding acknowledges that 'Coke was in the very prime of life, and though rather young for the office (being only forty-one), his reputation was already so great, his professional learning and experience so extensive, and his mastery of all the weapons of his craft so perfect, that youth was, in his case, no disadvantage. His energy was unrivalled; his constitution equal to any quantity of work; he had incurred no suspicion of popularity; and his devotion to the service of the Crown was not likely to be interfered with, either by nice scruples or by alien interests. Bacon was nine years younger; he had little or no practice in the courts; what proof he had given of professional efficiency was confined to his readings and exercises in Gray's Inn; his influence as a speaker in the House of Commons would be of little or no avail, for the Attorney-General was not then considered eligible; law, far from being his only, was not even his favourite study; his constitution was delicate, and his health uncertain.' The contrast between Coke and Bacon, as rival candidates, is put so cogently that it is difficult to see how, in the absence of other evidence than that with which so painstaking a biographer has furnished us, there can be any need for a question like the following:—'How came such a man (as Bacon) at such a time to be so much as proposed or seriously thought of as a fit competitor with Coke for such an office as that of Attorney-General?' The conclusive answer, to our mind, to any such query would be, that he never was so thought of, except by Essex—by a man, that is, whose great pride always was in forcing his way through obstacles, and whose partisanship might almost be taken as a presumptive proof that his *protégé's* own personal claims were so baseless or slender as to make success an absolute test of his patron's invincible influence.

The whole of the argument in favour of the closeness of Bacon's competition with Coke is founded, seemingly, in the long abeyance of the office. But the true explanation of this is to be found in the character of Queen Elizabeth and of Coke, much rather than in the conflicting pretensions of the latter and Bacon. It was ever the habit of this great sovereign to show a politic reluctance in the distribution of offices. She could not bear to create, as it were, delegates of her prerogatives; she would have far preferred, had it been possible, to have adminis-

tered every department in person. But in the special circumstances of this vacancy, there was peculiar matter for perplexity. It was clear from the first that none other than Coke could have the place; but there was that in the proofs he had already given of savage and uncontrollable temper, which might well cause hesitation in a monarch endued, Mr. Spedding well says, with 'a courage of that rare temper which can rise even into passion 'without disturbing the judgment;' and who, 'when she saw 'symptoms of mutiny in the House of Commons, and the issue 'doubtful, or the struggle inconvenient, though she stood her 'ground while the dispute lasted, took care that the dispute 'should not arise again.' Such a personage might well recoil from the evident necessity of bestowing the post of Public Prosecutor on a man whose temper knew no medium in its fits between the bull-dog and the cur, who would fly without a scruple on an abuse or an offender, however mighty, but could never hold without tearing and worrying. The contest during this year of indecision was not, we must repeat, between Coke and Bacon, but between Coke's enormous learning and acuteness and Coke's savage temper and brutal manners.

In respect to the inferior office, that, considering the competitors, there would have been no manifest absurdity in preferring Bacon, we are ready to acknowledge; but then, again, the meagreness of proof that Bacon's claims were disallowed, simply on the ground of his subsidy speech, must startle every reader. Again: the great and only confessed advocate for the elevation of the man of thirty-three (a mere boy according to the legal standard of age) is the enthusiastic, indiscreet Earl of Essex. There was nothing in the candidate's professional successes or experience to give him, independently of competitors, a right to the second place among the leaders of the bar any more than to the first. The real stress of Mr. Spedding's plea for his claims on this occasion is the hypothetical energy and plausibility of his canvass, the preceding year, against Sir Edward Coke; and how shallow and superficial is any presumption based upon this, we have already sufficiently shown. We are indeed told that all the judges and great officers of the kingdom were in favour of his candidateship; but, with the exception of a vague reference to the favour of the former in a letter from Lady Bacon to her son Anthony, no evidence of this is adduced. Essex's zeal in his cause is undoubted enough; but he stands alone. The Cecils give fair words, and probably might have been glad to have had their relative so highly placed; but neither Lord Macaulay nor Mr. Basil Montagu is at all justified in inferring, from the want of success of so untried a man, that his connexions envied and played him false. It is

sufficiently apparent that the Queen herself estimated his pretensions to legal honours at no more than their true value, without reference to any chance disfavour in which his popular oratory might have involved him. Poor Bacon himself writes to his brother a report of her Majesty having declared that his legal advancement had been already unduly great, 'that she hath never dealt so with any as with me (*in hoc erratum non est*); she hath pulled me over the bar (note the words, for they cannot be her own); she hath used me in her greatest causes.' Essex, too, communicates to his friend a conversation he had had with the Queen, when 'she did acknowledge that you had a great wit, and an excellent gift of speech, and much other good learning. But in law she rather thought you could make show to the uttermost of your knowledge than that you were deep'—proving in this, we think, her sagacity.

The fact that Bacon himself seems to have expected first one and then the other post appears scarcely of much importance. He knew he possessed the ardent support of the all-powerful court favourite, and he felt within himself a genius not specially legal, but universal, and able to master jurisprudence as any and all other subjects of human intelligence. Sir Walter Scott, a man surely of no overweening vanity, put forward, as may be seen in the *Life* by Lockhart, his claims to a seat on the Scotch Exchequer Bench; and Bacon, with faculties much more logical and trained, may well be excused for thinking he had a right to pre-eminence as precocious in legal honours as he had already conquered for himself in science. But it is impossible for us to consider he had just matter for complaint on having his claims neglected, or, indeed, to give much credit to his assertions that he should in consequence regard himself as marked out for neglect and contempt, and quit an ungrateful profession for the sequestered pursuits of science.

In his quest after the Mastership of the Rolls yet graver matter of accusation may be found than tokens of a too eager ambition and covetousness of official rank. This was then, as it is now, though not yet a very independent judicial office, one of the four highest stations within the reach of the Bar. It was now on the point of being vacated by Egerton on his rise to the Lord Keepership, and might fairly be regarded as a stepping-stone to that the loftiest of all legal preferments. For a post like this it seems rather strange that he should have intrigued, and yet, in his canvass, plumed himself on his neglect of his own interests and carelessness about advancement: 'Both my father, though I think I had greatest part in his love of all his children, yet in his wisdom served me as a last comer; and myself in mine own industry have rather referred

‘and aspired to virtue than to gain.’ But from this unanimous flourish of trumpets as preluding to a request for one of the greatest and most lucrative places in the realm, he goes on to ask Egerton point-blank for his interest and influence; ‘and in thankfulness thereof I will present your lordship with the fairest flower of my estate though it yet bear no fruit; and that is the poor reversion (of the Clerkship in the Star Chamber) which of her Majesty’s gift I hold; in the which I shall be no less willing Mr. John Egerton should succeed me than I would be willing to succeed your lordship in the other place.’ This offer Mr. Spedding describes as ‘an arrangement not substantially objectionable more than any of the innumerable cases of promotion in which the person who procures it becomes patron of the place which the promoted man leaves.’ We should have been glad had Mr. Spedding explained more particularly to what classes of public offices he refers, in respect of which it is accounted fair and honourable for a man high in office to use the influence derived from his station and character in obtaining a great public post for another, *in consideration* of a secret bargain with his *protégé* to accept a lucrative reversion for a member of his family. The real nature of Bacon’s proposition, and its character as an offer which was not to be published to the world, may be readily gathered, if more information were needed, from the suggestion tendered by our great philosopher in a subsequent epistle, viz. that the Lord Keeper might have ‘a deputation (from Bacon as the then holder of the reversion) in some apt person your lordship might choose, and so to a passing over to such depute, and then a name in the next degree is soon changed.’

In this last application, as in the former ones for the Attorney’s and Solicitor’s places, Bacon had the command of the influence of the Earl of Essex. The letters from which we have recently quoted prove further, that he was extremely willing to accept of Egerton’s interest in his behalf, while he was constantly importuning, both personally and through his family, Lord Keeper Puckering and the Cecils for their patronage; Lord Burleigh he solicited for office in such a strain as the following: ‘For perhaps you shall not find more strength and less encounter in any other.’ He was, in fact, always needing, and always asking for his friends’ interest, borrowing constantly from his brother Anthony, who was almost as poor as himself, and even going to Egerton, to ‘send for according to your place, to bring to reason’ a stern creditor, Sympson, the goldsmith, who had had the audacity to arrest him though one of the Queen’s Counsel when returning from the royal business at the Tower, ‘a man noted much as I have heard, for extremities and stout-

ness upon his purse.' Yet he utters occasionally a grand boast of his independence of patronage, and makes a merit of sending in to the Queen a direct personal application, based on no special recent service, for a grant of royal land worth eighty pounds a year; 'though I am an ill beggar, yet would I use no proctor; for I never received so much contentment of any man as I could find it in my mind to make him an author or mediator of my fortune.'

We do not mean to reproach this great man with folly in deeming himself deserving of high rank and office. No place in the kingdom, from that of preparer of court masques or a chamberlain's key to the Chancellorship or white staff of Treasurer, was too high or too low for his all-comprehensive genius. We are rather blaming his panegyrists and apologists for accusing his contemporaries and relatives, either of gross dulness of perception, or mean jealousy, in that they did not esteem aright the legal acumen of a man at whose doors so slender a company of attorneys yet rapped. He had done scarcely anything to win the patronage of clients; and it would have been assuredly censured as a bad example of court favouritism, and nepotism on the part of the Cecils, had the student of philosophy, however distinguished even at that time for written lucubrations on law, been preferred to experienced leaders of the bar—men of great practices, like Sergeant Fleming or Coventry.

It has been the fashion to lament that Bacon persisted in pursuing the law; that he did not rather devote himself exclusively to science. He was always threatening to do so, whenever one of what we must consider his somewhat unreasonable demands for promotion was rejected. But we cannot regard these declarations of intention, as does Mr. Spedding, in the light of serious plans. Rather, with Queen Elizabeth, we would consider them menaces, and likely with a sovereign, who was jealous of losing any ornament of her court, to have some effect, although they did not produce the wished-for result of extorting for the proposing recluse a lucrative post. Had he been serious in these pretended schemes, we doubt whether philosophy would have gained much. Bacon's great merit and true place in the history of science is that of the discoverer, or, in some measure, perhaps, the reformer of scientific methods. His was the glory, within the reach only of a comprehension like his, of pointing out the direct road; others could travel along it with equal or even greater wariness and diligence. Had he forsaken the court, the after portions of the *Novum Organum* might have been more correct and complete than they actually are; even so, they had scarcely been perfect, for the inductive method requires time and diversity of investigators, as no one more

clearly than himself has indicated ; but, at all events, the grand method of modern ages would have lacked the impulse given by the exalted rank and authority of the head of English Law.

But it is almost useless speculating on the possible gains to science from the absorption into its pursuits of Francis Bacon. He loved splendour as devotedly as though he had been a Villiers, and was as fascinated by the chances and labyrinths of a court intrigue as though he had been a *protégé* of a Killigrew, and had spent his boyhood on the backstairs of a palace. Mr. Spedding seems to consider his debts excusable, and even finds in the fraternal affection, which made Anthony Bacon embarrass himself to discharge them, rather an argument for the excusableness of the liabilities with which the latter never reproached him, than a proof of careless extravagance. His only apology is, that, from the sudden death of his father, he had been left but slenderly provided for ; but this cannot be accepted as a full apology for living far beyond his means. Possibly the bill of Sympson, that goldsmith noted for stoutness on his purse, was not for luxuries in the way of the man's business, but for loans, that trade acting as the bankers and money-lenders of the age ; but a reference made by him to a jewel in his possession, which cost 500*l.* and odd, unless it were a bequest from his father, induces a suspicion that he may have had, like George Herbert in his youth, a *genteel passion for fine clothes*. Expenditure on New Year gifts to the Queen, such as that of which we have record, viz. 'one petticoate of white sateen, embrothered all over like feathers and billets, with three brode borders faire 'embrothered with snakes and frutage,' can hardly be reckoned as instances of prodigality, if they were generally followed forthwith, as was this offering, by a suit for lands worth 80*l.* a year. But, where neither his rank as a private gentleman nor his relations with the court required it, he seems, if we may judge from the frequent complaints of his mother, to have maintained a retinue of servants and an establishment much beyond his means or immediate prospects.

In reference principally to Bacon's frequent embarrassments, Mr. Spedding gives us some amusing glimpses into the character of Lady Bacon, the mother of the greatest thinker, and sister-in-law and aunt of two of the first statesmen of the age. She appears to have been a lady who loved managing her own and her friends' households. The revels at Gray's Inn scandalize her : 'Alas !' she writes in June, 1595, 'what excess of bucks at Gray's Inn !' Even when she sends strawberries from Gorhambury, by 'a prettily catechized but yet untoward crafty boy of my kitchen,' to whom 'if you give sixpence of your own self, it is too much,' she cannot forbear adding a piece of advice as to her

son's private economy, 'Let not your men drink wine this hot weather.' But when, as too frequently happened, the subject of Francis's debts was brought up, the dame opens her mind very frankly on the management of his affairs. His servants are still the most fruitful source of her discontent, and, in her answer to a request for her consent to the sale of an estate of his, called Markes, discharged from her right to dower out of it, replies with a profusion of such criticisms on his attendants as 'a proud, profane, costly fellow,' and 'filthy wasteful knave,' and the like, refusing altogether to assist him, unless he let her manage his disbursements: 'For I will not have his cormorant seducers and instruments of Satan to him committing foul sin by his countenance.' We dare say Bacon's answer to this proposal was indeed obscure enough, in other respects than the handwriting, to justify his mother's complaint to Anthony: 'I send herein your brother's letter. Construe the interpretation. I do not understand the enigmatical folded writing.' It would certainly not have looked well for an aspirant to the place of Attorney-General to have been reduced to give up the management of his own affairs and household. But we doubt whether Lady Bacon's bitter charges of her son's loss of credit and reputation ought, although doubtless exaggerated, to be passed over lightly by his biographer, as indicating only that he was 'an over-trustful and over-indulgent master—and later experience showed that this was really one of his principal weaknesses.' Extravagance is thus turned rather into a matter of praise, as a sign of amiable weakness; and we may readily anticipate, from this interpretation of his mother's accusation, what will be Mr. Spedding's view of the charges on which he was condemned and disgraced by Parliament.

The interest of Bacon's life all through the reign of Elizabeth centres round the Earl of Essex; and Mr. Spedding devotes much space to this subject, as he has evidently bestowed great and conscientious research into the character of the relations between these two men. We have already above engaged ourselves to acquiescence in some measure on the propriety of Bacon's conduct in the last scene of this mournful episode of a glorious reign—acquiescence, that is to say, in it, in the abstract, as the conduct of A in the matter of the treason of B. But in our view of the character of the advocate, as interpreted by the rest of his life, what in itself might have been perfectly excusable and even high-minded, is not, as done by him, free from all taint of suspicion. The charges against him are, that being an intimate private friend, and, what is more, having received many kindnesses, and at least one great pecuniary present from Essex, he took an active part in securing his condemnation for

treason. As for Essex's gift of the Twickenham estate, it seems to us difficult to accept as a sufficient apology the view taken by Mr. Spedding (which, in all material points, agrees with the still more decided opinion of Mr. Hepworth Dixon), viz. that, 'in the account between the Earl and Bacon, the obligation was not all on one side. Bacon owed him much for his friendship, trust, and eager endeavours to serve him. He owed Bacon much, not only for affection and zeal, but for time and pains gratuitously spent in his affairs.' We do not doubt that Essex may have profited much from the friendship of a man like Bacon; but the services rendered by the latter appear to have been hardly other than could be, and were properly and fully requited by the continual efforts made to secure his advancement. These efforts indeed failed, but so did the counsels of Bacon; in this respect, the results of the friendship were on either side alike. Certainly no such apparent and tangible proof of affection passed to Essex from Bacon as to him from Essex. It is sufficiently manifest, from numerous facts adduced in these volumes, that the relations between the two were of a nature to allow of the acceptance by the almost briefless barrister of such a present without meanness; but there was nothing in the reciprocity of kindnesses between them to give the character of a mere return favour. *A fortiori*, must we signify our dissent from Mr. H. Dixon's representation of the grant as practically little more than payment of fees for Bacon's assistance in the Earl's complicated schemes.

It is quite a different question how far such a gift, even regarded as one without any consideration whatever—as, in fact, a simple benevolence (an extent to which we must by no means be considered as going)—could bar the recipient from free action, when the donor's conduct had grown dangerous to the quiet constitution of the kingdom. If Essex were indeed guilty of the wanton, baseless treachery against his benefactress laid to his charge; if, from mere spite and silly vanity, he was ready to set the kingdom in flames, and plot for the destruction of the Queen; it would be impossible to censure any loyal subject for showing his indignation at such mad ingratitude by taking a leading part in convicting the rebel. Our conclusion as to such conduct by a friend would, however, be widely different, if, as may possibly have been the case, Essex had been wrought upon by crafty misrepresentations of enemies to consider himself in real danger; and if the rambling nature of Coke's attacks, as Mr. Spedding describes them, and which so disguised the true aspect of the case that, we are told, 'some called it (the reason of the insurrection) a fear, others an error,' arose really from a deficiency of evidence of treasonable designs.

But this is beside the present question: whether the Earl were a deliberate traitor, or merely sallied out, as might a feudal baron of the Dark Ages have done, to have a brush with adverse nobles, Bacon might have been justified in preferring his duty as a subject, a Queen's Counsel, and a man whose courtiership dated from infancy, to the claims of private intimacy, however we might estimate his taste and delicacy of feeling. But the question is not so simple. The advice offered by Bacon to his friend on various occasions, and the other facts of the relations between them, seem to show that he was, up to a certain point, an accomplice in the Earl's projects, and that, though he certainly stopped far short of any treasonable plans which the other might have conceived, he was sufficiently compromised to make his interference in the prosecution assume rather the appearance of the conduct of a king's evidence. He tells the world, which had taken, Mr. Spedding seems to think, most gratuitously, to blaming him for the part he had played in this business, that, when the gift of land was made, he had said: 'Homage always is with a saving of faith to the king and his other lords; and therefore I can be no more yours than I was, and it must be with the ancient savings, and, if I grow to be a rich man, you will give me leave to give it back to some of your unrewarded followers.' Again, at the close of a letter, in November, 1595, he writes: 'I say I reckon myself as a common (not popular, but common); and as much as is lawful to be enclosed of a common, so much your lordship shall be sure to have,' as though to warn Essex he would not aid him in aught treasonable. But passages of this character do not, we confess, produce on us the impression which the biographer appears to have anticipated. They rather seem to indicate that, up to a certain point, Bacon had been privy to plans of the Earl, which had a sort of natural or logical outlet in treason; that he had, at all events, given his friend some ground for counting on his aid in dangerous courses. The advice tendered by him on various occasions appears to bear out this view. 'The only way,' he writes, 'is to quench it (*i.e.* popularity) *verbis* and not *rebus*. And therefore to take all occasions to the Queen to speak against popularity, and popular causes vehemently; and to tax it in all others; but nevertheless to go on in your honourable Commonwealth courses as you do. And therefore I will not advise you to cure this by dealing in monopolies or any oppressions.' In the same spirit of dissimulation and manœuvring, he recommends the Earl to ask for the Privy Seal, 'to divert her Majesty from this impression of a martial greatness.' All this careful preparation against, and almost anticipation of suspicion, makes one suppose that

Bacon was conscious of something which had to be kept concealed. There was no reason, in the nature of things, why the Queen should suspect Essex; he was almost a creature of her bounty, and all the splendour in which he gloried came from her. As it turned out, it does appear that she had fair matter for dread of his designs; but, considering that he was not a possible heir or pretender to the crown, we cannot understand why Bacon should thus sedulously have cautioned his patron to divert his sovereign's suspicions, unless on the supposition that he was himself aware of good grounds for such suspicion, and had himself had these matters communicated to him. The advice was, at all events, ill adapted to the genius of its recipient. Mr. Spedding says well of it: 'It was advice which, if not followed consistently, might better have been left alone. Fits of affected obsequiousness, interrupted by outbreaks of haughty self-opinion, formed the worst mixture: the one losing all its grace, and the other all its excuse; and such a mixture I am afraid it really led to.' Still worse must have been the tendency of the counsel which he has himself recorded he gave to Elizabeth on news of the Earl's ill success in Ireland, viz. to recall him, and give him a white staff, 'as my Lord of Leicester had; for to discontent him as you do, and yet to put arms and power into his hands, may be a kind of temptation to make him prove cumbersome and unruly.' It is not hard to fancy what a flame of doubt and wrath suggestions like this, that the Captain of England's only armed force was in a way to make himself troublesome to his sovereign, must have roused in so fiercely jealous a temperament. The same sort of ostentatiousness of estrangement from Essex, on the part of Bacon, we may discover in the suit to the Queen, already referred to, for a grant of crown-lands, wherein he declares that he 'never received so much contentment of any man as I could find it in my mind to make him an author or mediator of my fortune,' in this statement not so much showing forgetfulness of Essex's long struggles for his advancement, as desiring to recant and repudiate any dependence on or connexion with him.

We are far from supposing that Bacon was really compromised in any treasonable projects. The true explanation of his needlessly and elaborately subtle advice to Essex, and of his affectation of non-dependence on so generous a friend, seems to us to be, that Essex's conduct and schemes had always been of that headstrong and violent aspect which rivals and enemies might easily construe as a symptom of treasonable plans. Bacon must have clearly perceived and felt this long before the Irish expedition; but, from his desire to profit by the powerful favourite's

patronage, he was ready to connive at all. Treason, we may allow, he would not have been willing to countenance in any shape; but neither was there treason in this earlier stage of Essex's career; nor, we believe, was there ever any direct and deliberate criminality of this kind, however naturally success in the attack on court rivals might have led to it, even in the latter and disgraceful scenes of his life. An armed sally through Temple Bar, however manifest evidence of the traitor in the case of any other man, does not, to our mind, sufficiently prove it, when the actor was the same spoilt petted favourite who defied to mortal combat Howard of Effingham, the great sea-captain of the age, because his accepting of an earldom gave him, as high admiral, a temporary precedence over this vain young gentleman. If it were a deliberate plot against Elizabeth's sovereignty or life, it was strange indeed that Coke's attacks should have been so inconclusive; that no reason for the crime should ever have been adduced; that the nation should never have given credence to the charge. If it were a crime of this dye, it was still more marvellous that a man like Lord Montjoy should have, to so large an extent, sympathized at first with the design. If it were, on the other hand, a mad plot of Essex against the existing administration of the Queen's government, a conspiracy against the Cecils and the other sages of the Queen's Council who had often thwarted and shown contempt for the Earl's rash views, there is nothing insuperable in all these difficulties. Neither, on such a supposition, is there anything strange in Elizabeth's conduct towards her unworthy favourite. Long had she displayed forbearance towards his absurd caprices of envy and jealousy; scarcely once had he made a request for himself in vain; and her reward for all this was, in Ireland, something like a sulky determination to avoid gaining victory for her arms, and, on his return, a device for coercing her counsels, which, at least, would have tarnished all the lustre of her reign. He suffered quite justly; pity is almost wasted upon him; but we feel little doubt that the measures which culminated in that insane rush along the Strand were of no essentially diverse character from the general policy of his career, in which Bacon had long participated, and that, at the period of the famous gift of land, the latter had abundant materials for arriving, if at any time, at a conclusion that the character and the designs of the donor were not of a sort with which he ought to sympathize. Either a man, whom the recipient of his bounty had to warn that he must not expect from him services inconsistent with his duty to his sovereign, must have been then no fit source whence a loyal subject ought to have accepted pecuniary favours; or, if the excuse be, that

the disloyalty in his benefactor, of which he almost intimates the existence, was not treason, but wild intractability and conceit, the same extenuation of Essex's later designs ought to have suggested itself to his friend, and to have restrained him from playing the part he did in the final catastrophe; in neither case can Bacon's conduct be justified, whether it be his early readiness to receive kindnesses, or his very prominent part in the trial, which may be found the more worthy of condemnation. We, ourselves, are inclined to think that Bacon cannot be accounted disloyal for accepting a present from a person whom, at that very time, he spoke of as one fealty to whom, and to the Queen at the same time, might turn out to be impossible, for that he was then alluding, not to actual treasonable designs, but to a general tone of policy and feeling which might result in such; but we cannot but believe that, by a man of nice honour and generosity, the acceptance of such a favour from a personage whose character he foresaw might, by a sort of logical propriety, lead to the semblance of treason, would have been esteemed a retainer, and that, at least, he would have felt barred from taking a conspicuous part against his patron, when the circumstances, which he seems to have anticipated from his knowledge of that patron's character, were now come to pass.

But, we fear, reasons arising from honour and generosity were scarcely motives which appealed very strongly to Bacon's mind. His magnanimity was not of a sort which found any sphere for its display amid his struggles and anxieties as a bankrupt courtier and man of letters. Had he been born to a crown, or risen to be the prime minister and oracle of a docile sovereign, he would have founded universities more splendid than ever Wolsey conceived of, and made codes for new continents to obey. His virtues did not show well in the private relations of life, and the defects of his character, comparatively obscure as he was as a public man during the reign of Elizabeth, apparently the nation had gauged and measured. Every one knows into what odium his conspicuous hostility to Essex in the trial brought him; but some time before this, when the Earl first fell into disgrace on his return from Ireland, his fall was at once attributed by the people to his old friend. It is hard to see cause for Mr. Spedding's apparent satisfaction at his concise explanation of this outbreak of unpopularity:—'There was,' he says, 'blame due to somebody. It could not be Essex; it could not be the Queen; it was not the Council; it might be Bacon. He stood next; and against him the popular wrath gathered with a fury proportioned to its ignorance.' Why it could not be any of the personages first mentioned we are not told; nor why a man who was certainly, up to this time,

ranked as one of the Earl's most intimate acquaintances, should have been singled out as the secret agent in his benefactor's ruin. We should have fancied the reason might have been discovered, not by such a very summary instance of the exhaustive method, but in the supposition that Bacon was already believed popularly to be a man who would not let loyalty to a friend stand in the way of his possible advancement.

Unfortunately for our respect for Bacon's moral character, Mr. Spedding, so far as he has already proceeded in his most careful and trustworthy investigations, has produced nothing to neutralize the unfavourable impression caused by the incidents of Essex's catastrophe. He receives favours from a man: it is explained that he left the donor when he turned traitor; but did he ever restore the gift, or did he not, even when he accepted it, know the character of the giver? He assumes the most prominent part in the prosecution of an old friend who had been at least faithful always to him; we are told, the man was an ungrateful traitor—granted; but why, long before any public proceedings were taken, when, in fact, the only reason for the belief was the darkening state of the Earl's fortune, did the popular feeling burst out against one who had not yet by any open sign repudiated or disavowed the other's friendship and protection? If in the after scenes of the mighty philosopher's career, when every step was a step upwards in rank and fame, his biographer can find proofs of kindness, of willingness to incommode himself to do his neighbour a kindness, of respect for a rival, of forbearance and generosity towards an enemy even when fallen, let them be brought forward; with the exception of an intimation of his unwillingness to press a possible forfeiture in his favour, nothing in the first stages of his course has been alleged to make us pause and doubt the instinctive justice of the popular, or almost national, suspicions of the loyalty of his dealings in relation to the Earl of Essex.

We cannot but think Mr. Spedding's strictness in the testing of evidence somewhat deserts him whenever Bacon's reputation can profit by the laxness. We have already intimated our opinion on the evidence for Bacon's chances of the succession to the Attorney's and Solicitor's places, and the Mastership of the Rolls, and on the attempted demonstration of his economy founded on a brother's forbearance. Even on the subject of those dark methods pursued at the Tower for forcing out a confession from the accused, the biographer's decision seems biassed by the conduct pursued by his hero. We can scarcely think Mr. Spedding would, without noticing in the least the patent difficulties in the way of thus securing the unadulterated truth, have thus eulogized that barbarous policy:—'The usual order

‘ of proceeding in these cases seems in principle at least rational, and the likeliest that could be adopted for the discovery of the truth, supposing that to be the object ;’ unless for the circumstance that Bacon, in the case of Williams and others, had himself presided at the Tower during the process. Again, in reference to the famous subsidy debate, we most perfectly concur with Mr. Spedding in holding, that the belief ‘ that there had grown up in 1593, under the leadership of the Earl of Essex, a parliamentary opposition, whose object was to embarrass the ministers in the hope of supplanting them, is a modern suggestion, drawn from modern experiences, without a shadow of direct evidence to support it, and incredible to any one acquainted with those times :’ but it is strange to find our author, for the following reasons, affirming the truthfulness of Bacon’s account of his opposition :—‘ He writes (to Lord Burleigh) as if he thought it strange that any fault should be found with a member of parliament for moving an amendment which he honestly believed to be an improvement upon the original motion, as if his opposition to the Government measure could require no justification even in the eyes of ministers beyond an assurance that he really disapproved of it. Nor is there any reason for thinking that his surprise was affected. . . . For in every assembly which is truly deliberative—in every assembly whose business is not to decide whether this or that shall be done, but to consider what shall be done—this liberty of counsel must always be expected and allowed ; and such was still the character of the lower house.’ He adds, indeed, as a qualification—‘ though symptoms of a great change were already showing themselves :’ but, with our reminiscences of the fate of the Wentworths, Peter and Paul, of Morice, and others, it is incomprehensible how Mr. Spedding can have persuaded himself that, during the reign of Elizabeth, this *absolute* freedom of speech was ever anything else but a privilege to be fought for, and one very seldom, and at all events most reluctantly, conceded in matters of importance. Had he limited his theory to questions of finance, it would have been far more correct, though then not to the extent he maintains ; but, as it is, he has been led on, we may imagine, by a preconception that Bacon’s affectation of honest simple wonder why he should have been censured must have been based on a real belief and habit of the times ; and he has thence manufactured a picture of a free parliament, which goes far beyond what Hallam claims for the working constitution under the Tudors.

We have already stated how much too easily, in our view, the biographer allows a loose fact or two, eked out by hypothesis, to pass for proofs of Bacon’s right to throw off the obligations of

ancient friendship. Occasionally he even appears to assume a fact resting on no evidence whatever, because it would be in harmony with his conception of the character of the philosopher. For instance, we are told, without any document being cited, to bear out the remark, that, after the sentence had been passed on the Earl, 'private influence, Cecil's as well as Bacon's, was on the side of mercy.' It would certainly be pleasant to know that the old friend felt and recognised the claims of long familiarity, even though stern duty and the first claims of loyalty to his queen had made him do violence to his affection by coming forward, Brutus-like, to prove him guilty; but, unhappily, there is as little evidence for the propriety of his conduct at the one time as at the other, or, we presume, the biographer would have referred us to the source of his belief.

One word, on a somewhat cognate subject, and we have done. Mr. Spedding has printed in these last two volumes of his most valuable edition of Bacon various papers which, on the evidence of style, he attributes to Lord Bacon. The public ought, perhaps, to feel grateful to him at all events for being enabled to peruse some fine examples of the stiff brocade-like style of the period. But we feel rather doubtful of the sufficiency of the reasons on which they have been suffered to make their way into even this remote nook, whence they may gradually creep, people forgetting the character in which they have originally been admitted, into the position of well-authenticated works of the philosopher. Thus, four long, and we must confess, in our belief, rather ponderous, letters on travel by the Earl of Essex are assigned over to Bacon, and printed in these volumes, on arguments almost exclusively drawn from points of style. There can be no less conclusive evidence than this, especially when the person in whose name the papers have been ostensibly composed is a contemporary with, and, what is more, an intimate friend of the author, to whom the editor appropriates them. In such a case as the present, where, as Mr. Spedding acknowledges, the Earl would certainly endeavour to imitate his friend's tone of thought, any resemblance in the tricks of diction becomes of infinitely small importance for ascertaining the authorship. We must protest, for the same reasons, against the admission of certain weighty orations delivered at a Gray's Inn masque on the study of philosophy, war, and other topics. Mr. Spedding argues thus:—'That Bacon had a hand in the general design is merely a conjecture; we know that he had a taste in such things, and did sometimes take part in arranging them; and the probability seemed strong enough to justify a more detailed account of the whole evening's work than I should have otherwise thought fit. But that the

'speeches of the six councillors were written by him, and by him alone, no one who is at all familiar with his style, either of thought or expression, will for a moment doubt.' The precedent of thus giving over a number of compositions to one great author, some having been already fathered by another personage, and none ever claimed for that great author, either by himself or his friends, appears to us a dangerous one; and still more so, when, as in the last instance, the editor proceeds to establish certain facts about that great author's plans and feelings and resolutions by the authority of these documents, which were never before supposed to have any connexion whatever with him.

The character of Lord Bacon is, on all grounds, a subject of such interest, that we have thought it proper to examine strictly the grounds on which his most recent editor attempts to vindicate his morality. It would have been pleasant to have discovered that the chief of our philosophers was also a man of as pure a life and as amiable a heart as his successors, Boyle and Locke. Men love to find a sort of harmony of parts in the nature of a great man of any kind. It would be better if even the generalship of Marlborough could be seen to have consorted with somewhat more of generosity and honesty. But all this is matter rather for the gratification of sentiment than of importance as bearing on the character of the great man's genius. It may be terrible to hear of a philanthropist playing the tyrant at home, but it does not lessen our enthusiasm for the mathematical powers of Newton to read that he was cold-hearted. Neither is corruptibility as a friend or as a judge (though as to the latter point, so far as the question affects Bacon we reserve judgment) anything so incompatible with a wide comprehension of the necessities of natural philosophy, as to force an admirer of Bacon's method to accept a theory of his goodness of heart on pain of being compelled to disown his scientific system. The world's ardour of appreciation of the latter may still subsist, though men remain convinced of the defectiveness of its author's moral character, whether the want arose from coldness of nature or timidity.

ART. VII.—*The Principles of Divine Service. An Enquiry concerning the true Manner of understanding the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church.* By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A. Vicar of Thorverton, Prebendary of Exeter, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Exeter. Oxford: Parker. Vol. II. Part II. 1862.

Clerus Anglicanus, mundi stupor, was the seventeenth century verdict on the learning of our ecclesiastics. Did the English Church of the present day produce many such works as that which stands at the head of this article, the same eulogium would most assuredly be merited again.

We have, as the two former volumes of Mr. Freeman's book appeared, noticed them separately; and expressed our opinion that their appearance will hereafter be acknowledged to have formed an epoch in the annals of our Church. The present volume is, on the whole, certainly the most interesting, and probably the most valuable. It consists of four parts. The first, a dissertation on the theory of the Church's Eucharistic worship, as taken in connexion with the Jewish sacrifices; the second, a lengthened analogy between our Lord's oblation of Himself, on 'the same night in which He was betrayed,' and the general structure of the Christian Liturgy; the third, a view of the whole series of Liturgical families; the fourth, an application of the preceding chapters to our modern Anglican rite. It is to the third of these that we shall principally confine ourselves.

Before we proceed, we shall beg leave to renew, once for all, the protest we have previously had occasion to make against the author's most singular and unique view of the way in which the Holy Mysteries become the Body and Blood of CHRIST; and also against the idea—also, we believe, peculiar to Mr. Freeman, that, by the *sancta sanctis*, was originally at least intended, not 'holy things for holy persons,' but the holy things on earth are lifted up to the holy things in heaven, namely, our Lord's glorified body. Also, we are bound to notice the optimist way in which the author is given to regard our present Prayer-book; though not quite in the same degree as was the case in the former volumes. Here, for example, we find him allowing that the dislocation of the *Gloria in Excelsis* was a most unfortunate mistake; and that the argument adduced by Mr. Palmer for the wrong position of the LORD'S Prayer after the Consecration is worthless.

In alluding to the earliest Liturgies, we do not think that our author quite realizes how large a portion of S. Mark and S. James was actually of Apostolic composition. Indeed, it seems to us remarkable that, at the conclusion of his most valuable comparison of the Temple rite with the Christian Liturgy, he should not have drawn the conclusion, so extremely valuable and important, on which he actually trembles. Granting, as is undoubtedly the case, that the Church borrowed much from the Synagogue, when could she have done so, except during the period antecedent to the destruction of Jerusalem? That is, within the forty years which followed our LORD'S Ascension, the main parts of her two most ancient Liturgies were what they are now.

We propose, however, to dwell a little longer on this point. Our readers may remember that, two years ago, in an article on Liturgical Quotations, we endeavoured to show that one such quotation made by S. Paul was taken from the Liturgy of S. James—the famous verse, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," &c. We proved that the passage in question was not taken from the text in Isaiah, which in our English Bible, but then only, may be thought to have some little resemblance to it; that, nevertheless, the quotation was textual—so literally textual, as to be ungrammatical ('but, as it is written, WHICH eye hath not seen, nor ear heard'); and that the antecedent, and that word *which*, is supplied by S. James's Liturgy. We shall now make a few more remarks on this same verse, and, in general, shall continue the remarks we formerly made on the Pauline Epistles, with reference to the Isapostolic fathers. Let us first take S. Hermas. There is a remarkable passage, in the third book of the Shepherd, Similitude V. in which the same prayer in the Anaphora of S. James's Liturgy seems to be pointed out, which S. Paul, according to the hypothesis, quotes in 1 Cor. ii. 9. For facility of comparison, we parallelise the passage in the Liturgy, and that in S. Hermas.

We take the passage in the Shepherd, not from the old Latin translation of the second century, which was, till the year before last, the only entire version known to survive of S. Hermas, but from a fragment preserved in the *Doctrina ad Antiochum Ducem* of the pseudo-Athanasius:—

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.

'OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, taking bread in His holy, spotless, pure, and immortal hands, and looking up to heaven and showing it to Thee, His GOD and FATHER, He gave thanks, and hallowed, and brake, and gave it to His apostles and disciples saying,

S. HERMAS.

'First of all, be careful to fast from every evil word and sound, and cleanse thy heart from every spot, and from revenge and base gain.

'And on the day whereon thou fastest be content with bread and herbs [this item "*herbs*" is not found

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.

Take, eat, . . . Likewise also the cup after supper, having taken and mixed it with *wine and water*, and having looked up to heaven and displayed it to Thee His GOD and FATHER, He gave thanks, and hallowed, and blessed, and filled with the HOLY GHOST, &c. . . . We therefore also sinners, remembering His life-giving Passion, His salutary Cross, His glorious and terrible coming again, when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works, offer to Thee, O LORD, this tremendous and unbloody *Sacrifice*, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst not deal with us according to our iniquities, but according to Thy gentleness and ineffable love, passing by and blotting out *the handwriting* that is against us Thy suppliants, wouldst grant us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive *the things which Thou, O GOD, hast prepared for them that love Thee.*'—(*S. James's Liturgy*, page 62, Neale.)

S. HERMAS.

in the Latin version], and *water*, giving thanks to GOD (εὐχαριστῶν τῷ Θεῷ); and, having calculated the expense of the meal which thou wouldst have eaten that day, *give to the widow or the orphan, or the destitute, with which, having fully satisfied his soul, he will pray for thee to the LORD.*

'If, therefore, thou shalt accomplish thy fast as I have directed thee, thy SACRIFICE shall be acceptable before the LORD, and *written in the heavens* on the day of rendering of the good things which have been prepared for the righteous.—(*Shepherd of S. Hermas*, book iii. sim. v. 3.)

Then follows in the Liturgy the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the Prayer for all Conditions of Men. In the latter occurs this petition:—

'Remember, LORD, them that bear fruit and do good deeds in Thy holy Churches, and that remember *the poor, the widows, the orphans, the stranger, the needy*; and all who have desired us to remember them in our prayers.'

Now, with respect to many of the points of resemblance, we could not infer that the one of these being placed beside the other would even suggest that there is any connexion between the two passages. To say that the mention of the vine (immediately before the passage quoted from the Shepherd) and of the bread and water reminded S. Hermas of the bread, the wine, and the water of the Holy Eucharist (which are, of course, used in an entirely different sense) without further evidence would be ludicrously far-fetched. So also would it be to urge, from independent probability, any connexion in idea between the purification of the Christian insisted on by S. Hermas, and the 'holy, pure, and spotless hands of CHRIST,' in the Liturgy; although the phrase which accompanies it—'giving thanks to GOD'—(εὐχαριστῶν τῷ Θεῷ) is certainly more than suggestive. And although the 'rendering to every man according to his works' (Liturgy), fits well into the teachings of S. Hermas in

this Similitude, yet it does not convey upon its face any proof of close connexion between the two. When we come to the mention by S. Hermas of the 'widow, the orphan, and the destitute,' the supplication in the Liturgy may, perhaps, occur to us. It will certainly occur to us with very great force when we recollect that in it, as in S. Hermas, the petition for widows, &c. is connected with an inculcation of the efficacy of vicarious prayer.

'Give to the widow, or the orphan, or the destitute (says S. Hermas), with which, having fully satisfied his soul, he will pray for thee to the LORD.

'Remember, LORD, those who remember the poor (says the Liturgy), the widows, the orphans, the stranger, the needy; and all who have desired us to remember them in our prayers.'

As, however, we approach the end of the passage in S. Hermas, the resemblance between it and the Liturgy becomes much stronger and more pronounced. For in S. Hermas we find next the remarkable expression, 'Thy sacrifice shall be acceptable' (δεκτή), the regular Liturgical phrase). What sacrifice? He has spoken of none. Does he mean the sacrifice of our good works? But this sacrifice, apart from the eucharistic, which gives the reality, of which the other is but a counterpart, is as meaningless as in the same use would be the 'reasonable sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies;' or as David's sacrifice of 'the broken spirit' would be without the real presence of the 'young bullocks upon the altar,' to which he alludes in the same passage. Or does S. Hermas mean plain and direct the sacrifice of the Eucharist? Either way the explanation points, as it seems to me, in the direction of the Liturgy. If the term be used metaphorically, the reality on which the metaphor is based must be the eucharist. If, however, it be used directly of the eucharist, that is all we want. However this may be (we offer the suggestion with diffidence), here are the two phrases. In the Liturgy, 'The tremendous and unbloody sacrifice;' in S. Hermas, 'The sacrifice acceptable to God.'

In both occurs the metaphor of the 'writing.' In the Liturgy, 'That GOD will blot out the *handwriting* that is against us;' in S. Hermas, 'That our sacrifice may be *written* in heaven.'

Lastly, let us notice the conclusion of each.

In the Liturgy, 'the heavenly gifts;' in S. Hermas, 'the sacrifice written in heaven.'

In the Liturgy, 'The gifts (ἐπουράνιου καὶ αἰώνιά σου δωρήματα, S. James—τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν σου ἀγαθά, S. Mark, p. 21, Neale), which Thou hast prepared, O GOD, for them that 'love thee'—(ἃ ἡτοίμασας, ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι σε). In S. Hermas, 'On the day of rendering the good things which have been prepared for the righteous')—ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως τῶν ἡτοιμασμένων ἀγαθῶν τοῖς δικαίοις).

This is the first passage which arrests our attention. It would perhaps, be easy enough to explain away each particular point of resemblance: less easy to explain away the cumulative evidence of the whole series. It should be added, however, that the passage of S. Hermas, as rendered in the Greek, is much closer in resemblance to the Liturgy than the same passage as rendered in the old Latin translation. This fact will lend no small interest for the publication of 'Tischendorf's newly-discovered MS. of S. Hermas,' which is announced for this year. In the Latin version, the Greek *θυσία* is rendered by *hostia*.

The next passage to which we call the reader's attention is in the Second Epistle of S. Clement. We are not concerned now to dispute as to the apostolic antiquity of this Epistle. Whether it be his epistle, or the epistle of somebody else; whether it be an epistle at all, or only a sermon, may be an interesting subject for discussion, to those who will admit into their index no writings, however brief and unpretending, except those for which positive external proof can be adduced. Suffice it to remember, that there is no proof in the Epistle itself which may deprive it of its claim to primitive antiquity, and that fourth-century writers speak of it as of unknown antiquity in their day. In the plan to which we allude, the author has been quoting a passage from some lost apocryphal book, about the vine (the very same passage, by the way, which is quoted at length in the First Epistle, chap. xxiii.). He says that, as in the vine there is first the leaf, then the sour grape, and lastly, the rich cluster, so shall the Christian go through many changes and developments, but shall finally attain to his reward (*ἔπειτα ἀπολήψεται τὰ ἀγαθά*). 'Therefore, brethren,' he continues, 'let us not be faint-hearted, but abide in hope, that we may win 'our reward.' We place the rest of the passage in parallel columns with those in the Liturgies of S. James and S. Mark:—

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.

Page 69.

We, therefore, also sinners, remembering His life-giving Passion . . . His glorious and terrible coming again, when He shall come . . . to render to every man according to his works, offer to Thee, O LORD, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, beseeching Thee that thou wouldst not deal with us after our sins, . . . but according to Thy gentleness and ineffable love, . . . wouldst grant us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man the things which Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee

EPISTLE OF S. CLEMENT.

II. II.

For he is faithful that promised to render to every man the recompence of his works. If, therefore, we shall do justice in God's sight we shall enter into His kingdom, and shall receive the promises which ear hath not heard, nor eye seen, nor hath entered into the heart of man.

Let us therefore expect, in due time, the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, since we know not the day of God's manifestation (*ἐκφάνει*).

LITURGY OF S. MARK.

Page 21.

(Diptychs of the Departed.)

And to all the spirits of these give rest, our Master, LORD and God, in the tabernacles of Thy saints, vouchsafing to them in Thy kingdom the good things of Thy promise, which eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and it hath not entered into the heart of man, the things which Thou hast prepared, O God, for them that love Thy holy Name. Grant rest to their souls, and vouchsafe to them the kingdom of Heaven; and to us grant that the end of our lives may be Christian, &c.

We will leave this passage to speak for itself, merely remarking on the *πιστὸς γὰρ ἐστίν*, &c. so common with S. Paul when introducing a Liturgical quotation or reference. One thing is remarkable. The order of the substantives is inverted. Whereas S. James and S. Mark say with S. Paul, 'What eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,' the author of this Epistle puts the *ear* before the *eye*, and says, 'which ear hath not heard, nor eye seen.' This is perhaps exactly the sort of variation to be expected, in quoting a Liturgy which is learnt by heart for the most part. In such a case it could scarcely be called a mistake, which it would assuredly be if it professed to be quoted from a written epistle. And this idea was confirmed by the discovery of the same passage in the Acts of the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp—that most beautiful and touching of all the uninspired writings of the Apostolic age. The quotation there is identical with this one from the Second Epistle of S. Clement. Here it is. The author, or rather authors, are speaking of the sufferings of the Martyrs, and the reason of their courage.

'For they had before their eyes, the escape from that fire which is eternal and shall never be quenched, and with the eyes of their heart they looked to those good things which are reserved for the enduring, *which neither ear hath heard, nor eye seen, nor hath entered into the heart of man*, but which have been shown by the LORD to them, inasmuch as they were not men any longer, but already angels.'—*Martyrdom of S. Polycarp*, Act 2.

Here are the parallel passages in the Greek:—

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.
Page 63.

τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ αἰωνία σου
δωρήματα, ἃ ὀφθαλμὸν οὐκ
εἶδε, καὶ οὐτ' οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ
ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ
ἀνέβη, (ἃ ἡτοίμασας, ὁ Θεός,
τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι σε).

MARTYRDOM OF S. POLY-
CARP.—Act 2.

τὰ τηρούμενα τοῖς ὑπομείνα-
σιν ἁγαθὰ, ἃ οὐτε οὐκ ἤκουσεν,
οὐτε ὀφθαλμὸς ἶδεν, οὐτε, ἐπὶ
καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη, (ἐκεί-
νοις δὲ ἐπιδείκνυτο, κ.τ.λ.)

2 S. CLEM.
xi.

ληφόμεθα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας
ἃς οὐκ οὐκ ἤκουσεν, οὐδὲ ὀφθαλ-
μὸς ἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀν-
θρώπου ἀνέβη. (ἐκδεχόμεθα
οὖν καθ' ὕψος τὴν βασιλείαν
τοῦ Θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.)

It is worth noticing how all these passages identify the sentiment 'which eye hath not seen,' &c. with the second Advent of CHRIST; an idea very prominent in the prayer of the Liturgy, but not occurring in the passage in the Epistle of S. Paul. 'Remembering,' says the Liturgy, 'His life-giving Passion, 'His salutary Cross, . . . and His glorious and terrible coming 'again (*τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβησᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας*), 'when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and dead, 'and to render to every man according to his works,' &c. Grand and terrible words! fit preface to the sweet promise of infinite reward and happiness, which, rising from Christian lips in the daily oblation, seemed to remind the giver of His promise, and even to furnish the meet expression to the yearnings of the faithful!

Constantly, in reading the early Fathers, we feel, 'The writer

' could not have spoken thus had not the words of this promise ' been floating before him;' but, on examining closely the passage, there is only a general resemblance, such as cannot be quoted without incurring the charge of conjuring up an imaginary form upon a background which supplied features of resemblance possibly fortuitous. Such passages we refrain from quoting. One of them, however, we cannot help pointing out, from the writings of a Father immediately after the Apostolic age:—

' This expression (says S. Justin Martyr), "Binding his foal unto the Vine, and his ass's colt unto the Choice Vine," is a foreshadowing of the works which He did *at His first coming* (ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης αὐτοῦ παρουσίας) and foreshadows the Gentiles who should believe in Him. . . . And they have borne the yoke of His instruction, and submitted their backs *to endure all things, because of the good things which they look for, and which He has promised* (πρὸς τὸ πάντα ὑπομένειν διὰ τὰ προσδοκώμενα καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατηγγεμένα ἀγαθά).—*Dial.* 54.

This resemblance may be accidental, perhaps. If so, it is remarkable.

The next which we will mention is one of most singular interest in the First Epistle of S. Clement. Where shall we find the same class of quotations as those used by S. Paul, if not in the Epistle of ' The beloved fellow-labourer whose name is in the Book of Life;' an epistle written, too, to the same Corinthians, whom S. Paul addressed in words of such earnest and sorrowing love? Besides, his polished and full style affords more scope for Liturgical quotation and reference than the terse practical missives of S. Ignatius do, or, indeed, than the style of any other of the Apostolic Fathers would lead us to expect.

It is the more valuable as containing not only the famous Pauline quotation, ' What eye hath not,' &c., but also other words and expressions direct from the Liturgy (in the same Liturgical prayer), to which there is no allusion whatever in S. Paul. We need not point out the importance of this—more than importance, indeed; for if the fact can be established, there is an end of the question—the Liturgists have the day.

S. Clement is saying that GOD made man after His own image. Man must therefore strive after perfection. We have CHRIST for an example (ὑπογράμμος), therefore let us do good works. He then proceeds with the passage which we tabulate together with the Liturgy of S. James and the passage in S. Paul. We may as well premise that in the Liturgy the Triumphal Hymn (Holy, holy, holy, &c.), shortly precedes the quotation, we therefore have added it at the head of the column.

I S. CLEMENT.
xxxiv.

The good workman receives with confidence (*παρρησίας*) the Bread of his work, the lazy and negligent cannot look in the face of his master. It is necessary, therefore, that you should be zealous in good works. For of Him are all things. For He says to us, 'Behold the Lord, and His reward is before His face, to render to every man according to his works' (*ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ*). He urges us, therefore, with all our heart thereto, that we should not be idle or remiss to every good work. Let our heart and our confidence (*παρρησία*) be in Him. Let us submit ourselves to His will. Let us consider the whole multitude of His angels, how standing near Him they do service to His will (*λεितουργοῦσιν παρρησιῶτες*). For the Scripture says, 'Ten thousand times ten thousand stood by Him, and thousand thousands ministered to Him,' and they vociferated (*ἐκέκραγον*), 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth, the whole creation is full of His glory.' And we therefore, having unanimously assembled together, by our conscience, let us cry (*βοήσωμεν*) to Him intensely (*ἐκρενῶς*), as from one mouth, that we may become partakers of His great and glorious promises. For He says, 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, how many things He hath prepared for them that await Him.'

It requires small critical knowledge to see which of the three passages has furnished quotations for the other two. Now let us examine the citations, apparently from the Old Testament, in this chapter of S. Clement; and first with regard to that beginning, 'Behold the Lord.' It looks at first sight like a plain quotation from the Prophets. But on referring to the margin we find that the commentators are not satisfied that they have found any single text which will fit. They have therefore given two references. We tabulate them here:—

S. CLEMENT.

Behold, the LORD, and His reward is before His face to render to every man according to his works.

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.
Page 62 (Greek).

(Cherubim and Seraphim hymn Thee), singing with a loud voice, crying (*βοῶντα*), praising, vociferating (*ἐκκράζοντα*), and saying (*λέγοντα*), 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth: Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest: blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest.' . . . We therefore also sinners remembering His life-giving Passion, His salutary Cross, His death and Resurrection from the dead on the third day, His ascension into heaven, and session on the right hand of Thee His God and FATHER, and His glorious and terrible coming again, when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and dead, and to render to every man according to his works (*ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*), offer to Thee, O LORD, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities; but according to Thy gentleness and ineffable love, passing by and blotting out the handwriting that is against us, Thy suppliants, wouldst grant us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee.

S. PAUL.

1 Cor. ii. 1.

And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. And I was with you in weakness and in fear, and in much trembling; and my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the honour of God. Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect (*σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις*), yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to naught: but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory: but as it is written, 'eye (*ὃ ὁφθαλμὸς*) hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.'

OLD TESTAMENT.

Behold, the LORD GOD will come with a strong hand, and His arm shall rule for Him: behold, His reward is with Him, and His work before Him.—*Isa. xl. 10.*

Behold, the LORD hath proclaimed unto the end of the world, Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh; behold, His reward is with Him, and His work before Him.—*Isa. lxii. 11.*

There is nothing more here than a certain general resemblance. The first part of the sentence in S. Clement seems to be a reminiscence of these passages in Isaiah. The latter half is literally word for word identical with the expression in the Liturgy.

[S. CLEMENT.]

ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ.

See Epistle 2. Ch. xi. (already quoted).

πιστὸς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος τὰς ἀντιμισθίας ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. (Here we get the element of the *μισθός*.)

LITURGY.

(ἔταν μέλλῃ) ἀποδιδόναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

Now for the other quotation. This, too, has embarrassed the commentators. It is from no single passage of Scripture. Two passages are quoted as furnishing the original.

S. CLEMENT.

Ten thousand times ten thousand stood by Him, and thousand thousands ministered to Him, and they vociferated, Holy, holy, holy, LORD of Sabaoth, the whole creation is full of His glory.

OLD TESTAMENT.

A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him: thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him: the judgment was set, &c.—*Dan.* vii. 10.

And one (seraph) cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of His glory. And the posts of the door moved, &c.—*Isa.* vi. 3.

The passage in S. Clement is, you see, a combination of these two texts—an anthem compiled from them. A verse is taken from Daniel and another from Isaiah, and both are linked together by the expression, *and they vociferated* (καὶ ἐκέκραγον). The materials are evidently from the Old Testament, but the composition of them is new and artificial. Is this anthem the original composition of S. Clement? Examine this passage from the Liturgy of S. Mark, and judge. (S. James's Liturgy contains it also, but at greater length; we therefore select S. Mark in preference.)

‘Thou art above all power, and dominion, and might, and principality, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come. Round Thee stand thousand thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand armies of holy angels and archangels. Round Thee Thy two most honourable creatures, the cherubim with many eyes, and the seraphim with six wings, with twain whereof they cover their feet, with twain their face, and with twain they do fly; and vociferate (κέκραγεν) one to the other, with incessant voices and perpetual praise, singing, vociferating, glorifying, crying (ᾄδοντα, βοῶντα, δοξολογοῦντα, κεκραγόντα), and saying to the Majesty of Thy glory the triumphal Trisagion:—*Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth: heaven and earth are full of Thy holy glory.*’—*S. Mark's Liturgy*, p. 21.

The quotation in S. Clement is simply the backbone of this passage. Clear away the redundancies and you have S. Clement's very words. We have written them in italics in the above passage from S. Mark's Liturgy. Notice, too, how the diction of the passage in S. Clement breathes of the Liturgy, especially in this sentence :—

καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες, τῇ συνειδήσει, ὡς ἐξ ἐνὸς στόματος βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἑκτενῶς, εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ.

ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ—ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ—τῇ συνειδήσει—βοήσωμεν—ἑκτενῶς—μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι, κ.τ.λ. All these are eminently Liturgical phrases. And it seems to us that any one denying the exclusively Liturgical application of the passage evacuates of its meaning the sentence about the angels; whose presence and assistance at the Holy Eucharist the Church recognises and has ever striven to realize. S. Clement merely paraphrases, in a few words, the preface to the Trisagion, when he says :—

κατανοήσομεν τὸ πᾶν πλήθος τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ πῶς τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ λειτουργοῦσιν παρεστῶτες.

The Liturgy (S. James) specifies 'angels, archangels, thrones, 'dominations, principalities, virtues; the many-eyed cherubim, 'and the seraphim with six wings, with twain of which, &c. ' &c.,' at great length: (see also in S. Mark's Liturgy)—τὸ πᾶν πλήθος τῶν ἀγγέλων—'all the company of heaven'—includes them all.

It may be worth a passing notice to observe that the slight difference in the phraseology of the Trisagion tells in favour of the proof that S. Clement quotes the Liturgic version.

πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, says Isaiah.
πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, say all the three Liturgies—S. James, S. Mark, S. Clement. (And the Ambrosian hymn follows them.)
πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, says S. Clement here.

In the chapter before he had said :—

'The Creator . . . by His Almighty power established *the heavens* and adorned them with His incomprehensible wisdom: and He separated *the earth* from the surrounding water, and settled it on the firm foundation of His own will.'

So that we see the signification of S. Clement's κτίσις.

Neither is there any difficulty in the expression 'For he says,' as if that necessarily identified the quotation with a text from the inspired Scriptures. S. Paul uses the same phrase for introducing quotations of unquestionably ecclesiastical character, e. g. :—

'Wherefore he saith (Διὸ λέγει),
Awake thou that sleepest,
And arise from the dead,
And CHRIST shall give thee light.—Eph. v. 14.'

In this latter instance the margin, with some embarrassment, suggests, 'IT saith.'

It is noticeable that, in the first of the three quotations in this thirty-fourth chapter, the words prefacing it are, *προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν*; the quotation being probably Liturgical. In the second, which is undoubtedly compiled originally from holy Scripture, the words are, *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή*. And in the case of the third ('eye hath not'), which is unquestionably Liturgical, the words are, *λέγει γὰρ*, 'it says,' to adopt the marginal reading as quoted above. Thus much for the passage itself. Now let us sound the chapter before and the chapter after, and see if we can find any further coincidences. Considering the nature of the proofs already adduced, any additional evidence will be of most powerful value.

Now, immediately following the Trisagion, in the Liturgy of S. James, and preceding the words of Institution, there occurs a prayer, the key-note of which is *the Fall of man from the image of God in which he was created, and the restoration of that image by Christ, who 'with His holy, and undefiled, and blameless, and immortal hands took bread,' &c.* We write out the prominent parts of the two passages in parallel columns:—

1 S. CLEMENT.
xxxiii.

For the Creator (*δημιουργός*) Himself and Master of all rejoices in the works. For by His Almighty power He established the Heavens, and adorned them by His incomprehensible wisdom Above all with *His holy and blameless hands* He formed man, the most excellent of His creatures, and the greatest, as endowed with reason, *the impress of His own image*. For thus says God, *Let us make man after our own image and likeness*. And God made man, &c. (of whom CHRIST became the *ὑπογραμμός*: and so the chapter ends.)

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.
Page 50 (English).

Holy art Thou, O omnipotent, Almighty, good, tremendous, long-suffering and of great compassion towards Thy creatures: Thou Who *didst make man from the earth after Thine image and likeness*, and didst give him the delight of Paradise, and when he . . . fell, Thou didst not . . . leave him, but didst . . . send forth into the world Thine only-begotten Son our LORD JESUS CHRIST, that He might come and *renew and restore in us Thine image*, Who . . . in the night wherein He was betrayed . . . taking bread in *His holy, and undefiled, and blameless, and immortal hands*, and looking up to Heaven . . . He gave thanks, &c.

The passages are identical in argument, and very familiar in expression. Notice the phrase, '*blameless hands*.' A man using, on his own invention, such an expression as the *ἁμωμοὶ χεῖρες* of his GOD would be, at least, bold. But the Liturgy applies it distinctly to the action of the Man CHRIST at the Eucharist. S. Clement, having the Liturgy before his mind, and thinking of CHRIST in the capacity of Creator of that mankind whom He was to recreate in the Eucharist, applies to the

first act a term borrowed from the second. This seems unquestionable. Here are the parallel Greek texts:—

S. CLEMENT.

ἄνθρωπον ταῖς ἱεραῖς καὶ ἀμώμοις
χερσὶν ἐπλασεν τῆς ἐαυτοῦ εἰκόνης
ρακτῆρα.

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.

περὶ τὸ πλάσμα τὸ σὸν· ὁ ποιήσας
ἀπὸ γῆς ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα σὴν καὶ
ὁμοίωσιν.
λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ
ἁχράντων καὶ ἀμώμων καὶ ἀθανάτων
αὐτοῦ χειρῶν . . . ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ.

This passage in S. Clement begins with the title *δημιουργός* as applied to GOD. He constantly uses it all through his Epistle. The Liturgies, too, use it constantly. Would S. Clement, in face of the Gnostic heresy, have ventured thus to employ the term, unless thoroughly adopted and sanctioned by Liturgical use? This by the way.

So much for the chapter preceding the thirty-fourth: now for the chapter which follows it. Here, too, are the footprints of the Liturgy, and imprinted in right and even order and sequence.

Now we cannot in the limited space of an article do justice to this chapter. The whole must be read to be appreciated. The soil of the original Greek is perfectly volcanic with Eucharistic phrases and turns of expression. After concluding the last chapter with the quotation 'eye hath not seen,' &c. he continues thus:—

'How blessed and wonderful are the gifts (*δῶρα*) of GOD, beloved! Life in immortality (*ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασία*—see S. Ignat. Eph. xx. end), splendour in justification, truth in confidence (*παρρησία*), faith in trust, temperance in sanctification, and all these things fall within our understanding (*διάνοιαν*). What then are "the things which are prepared for them that await Him?" The CREATOR and FATHER of ages, the *All-holy* One Himself (*ὁ πανάγιος αὐτός*), knows their abundance and their beauty. Let us, therefore, strive to be found in the number of those who await Him, that we may share in the promised gifts (*ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων δωρέων*). But how shall this be, beloved? If the powers of our minds (*ἡ διάνοια*) be firmly set on faith towards GOD. If we search out what is well-pleasing and acceptable to Him, if we shall perform the rites which are due (*εἰὰν ἐπιτελήσωμεν τὰ ἀνήκοντα τῇ ἀμώμῳ βουλήσει αὐτοῦ*) to His blameless Will, and shall follow the path of truth, *having cast away from ourselves* every injustice and lawlessness, *all avarice* (*πάσαν πλεονεξίαν*), stripes, evil manners, and *guile* (*δόλους*), whispering and backbitings, impiety, pride, and arrogance, *vain-glory* (*κενοδοξίαν*), and churlishness. They who do these things are hateful to GOD.'—1 Clem. xxxv.

In the corresponding place in the Liturgy we find the following passage. Addressing GOD, the priest prays thus:—

'Thou hast received in Thy goodness the gifts (*δῶρα*), presents, fruits, that have been offered before Thee for a sweet-smelling savour, and hast been pleased to sanctify and perfect them (*ἀγιάσαι καὶ τελειῶσαι*) by the grace of Thy CHRIST and the visitation of Thy *All-holy* SPIRIT (*παναγίου*

σου πνεύματος). Sanctify (*ἀγλασον*) also, O LORD, our souls, bodies, and spirits: touch the powers of our minds (*τὰς διανοίας*), search out our consciences, and cast out from us every evil thought, every impure imagination, every base lust, . . . all falsehood and guile (*δόλον*), every worldly distraction, all avarice (*πᾶσαν πλεοναξίαν*), all vain-glory (*πᾶσαν κενοδοξίαν*), all idleness, . . . all motion of body and soul at variance with the Will of thy Holiness.'

There seem to be many points of resemblance here; they can scarcely be accidental, especially considering the position of the two passages. We cannot produce in writing the conviction which influences one who comes upon these coincidences in searching for them. One reads a passage in S. Clement and detects a clause or a phrase identical with some expressions in the Liturgy. One reads on, and gradually another phase of argument or exhortation unfolds itself from the pages of the Fathers. One turns anxiously and nervously to the Liturgy, to see whether similar matter follows there, too, in due sequence. And there, sure enough, it is, just in the very place where one looks for it! It is true that in many of these passages the resemblance may, at first sight, seem fanciful. But we argue that the combination of them in the order and sequence in which one finds them cannot be accidental, but must be designed; and besides, that in many instances the actual resemblance is anything but fanciful. Of course, we do not mean to speak thus of a direct quotation, such as those in Chapter xxxiv. In such cases, the evidences supply positive proof. But in chapters such as the thirty-fifth, the resemblances may seem to some accidental, at first sight. Not so, however, on further examination. Look at the terms used. Where did S. Clement get that word *πανάγιος*, which he uses so confidently?—*ὁ πανάγιος αὐτὸς*, as though he wished to strengthen the idea by the use of a title familiar to all. But how familiar? It is not a Scriptural term; but the Liturgies all teem with it, long before it became a distinctive epithet of the Virgin. Hence, then, its use by S. Clement here.

Notice, too, the identical substantives used to express the passions, introduced by the same idea of 'casting out.' Lastly, notice how S. Clement concludes his exhortation. No one can doubt of the thoroughly Eucharistic sense of the whole when he reads this conclusion. Immediately after the passage above rendered, he gives (from Ps. 1) a quotation ending, 'the sacrifice of praise (*θυσία αἰνέσεως*) shall glorify me, and there is the way, whereby I shall show to him the salvation of GOD.' He then sums up. 'This is the way, beloved, whereby we find JESUS CHRIST our salvation, the High Priest of our oblations, the Defender and Helper of our infirmity;' and so on in the same strain.

Before leaving the Epistle of S. Clement, we will venture to ask this question: If these passages, three in number, from the Apostolic Fathers do not quote the Liturgy in the text, 'What eye hath not seen,' &c., what do they quote? Do they quote Isaiah? We tabulate them side by side with the text in Isaiah, which is the only original that has ever been suggested for the quotation in S. Paul:—

Isaiah.	S. Paul.	1 S. Clement.	2 S. Clement.	Acts of S. Polycarp.	Liturgy of S. James.
Ixiv. 4.	1 Cor. ii. 9.	xxxiv.	Chap. xi.	Chap. ii.	P. 63 (Greek).
ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον Θεὸν πλην σου, καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομνουσιν ἑλεον.	ἃ ὀφθαλμοὶ οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.	ὀφθαλμοὶ οὐκ εἶδον, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν τοῖς ἐν' ὁμνουσιν αὐτόν.	ἃς οὐτε οὐκ ἤκουσεν, οὐδὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἶδον, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.	ἃ οὐτε οὐκ ἤκουσεν, οὐτε ὀφθαλμοὶ ἶδον, οὐτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.	ἃ ὀφθαλμοὶ οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἠτοίμασεν, ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι σε.
From eternity have we not heard, nor have our eyes seen, a god beside Thee, and Thy works which Thou shalt do to them that wait for mercy.	Which eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and upon the heart of man hath not ascended, what God hath prepared for them that love Him.	Eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and upon the heart of man hath not ascended, how many things He hath prepared for them that wait for Him.	Which ear hath not heard, nor eye hath seen, nor upon the heart of man, hath ascended.	Which neither ear hath heard, nor eye hath seen, nor upon the heart of man hath ascended.	Which eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and upon the heart of man hath not ascended, what Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee.

It is impossible to suppose that they quoted this passage in Isaiah. There is hardly a word or an idea the same. No criticism can be strained to admit it.

So they then quote S. Paul?

But S. Paul himself expressly asserts that the words are not his own, but quoted; and, indeed, puts the construction of his sentence to some inconvenience, in order to introduce them abruptly and faithfully as a borrowed quotation.

It comes, then, to this.

These Fathers all quote what S. Paul quotes. They all use the same phraseology. Yet nowhere in Scripture is the original text to be found, nor any in a reasonable degree resembling it. There seems to be no alternative. All (including S. Paul) *must* quote the Liturgy, the one common, daily-used, possession of all.

It is even the case that, of all the quotations, S. Paul's comes nearest in diction to the Liturgy. All the others have antecedents with which their relatives agree. His has none.

⁴ καθὼς γέγραπται ἃ ὀφθαλμοὶ.—S. Paul.
 τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἃς οὐκ ἤκουσεν.—2 S. Clement xi.
 τὰ . . . ἀγαθὰ, ἃ οὐτε οὐκ ἤκουσεν.—Acts of S. Polycarp.
 1 S. Clement xxxiv. quotes without relative.

And the Liturgies:—

‘τὰ ὀρημάτα, ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε.—S. James.

τὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν σου ἀγαθὰ, ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε.—S. Mark.

All, it will be observed, except S. Paul, weave the quotation into their sentences. He is so anxious to acknowledge it, that, in order to keep the reference clear, he preserves the relative as it stands in the Liturgy: a construction which makes the sentence appear very harsh, and to any one unacquainted with its faithful allegiance to the Liturgy so inexplicable that the translators of the Bible have actually ventured to omit it altogether.

We may very fairly ask those who do not allow the quotation of the Liturgies by S. Paul:—How, then, do you explain this phenomenon from the Apostolic Fathers? Give us *any* other solution, probable or improbable. We see none, and we venture to think that none can be found.

The next passage which arrests us is in the second chapter of the same Epistle. There is no direct quotation in it; but, apparently, there are a great many allusions. Supposing the Liturgies to be already in existence at the time when the Epistle was written, the allusions are far too pointed to fail in reminding its readers of their Liturgy: supposing the Liturgies not to be in existence, the coincidences seem remarkable enough to call for some other explanation, if any could be found. It appears to be exactly the kind of passage which a man would write who is addressing general readers, both catechumens and faithful, yet who wishes to use the most solemn priestly persuasion to those of them who were in a position to understand it, without encroaching on the forbidden ground fenced in by the ‘Disciplina Arcani.’

The sentence in question opens with a bold and metaphorical substantive; so bold and metaphorical, indeed, as at once to fix the attention.

‘Being furnished with the *viaticum* of God (τοῖς ἐφόδιοις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρκοῦμεναι), and hearkening diligently to His word, ye were enlarged in your bowels, and His Passion was before your eyes.’

Such are the words with which S. Clement begins this exhortation in the second chapter of his First Epistle. Now, what are these ἐφόδια τοῦ Θεοῦ—this *viaticum* of God? Archbishop Wake, not seeing the Liturgical drift of the diction, does not venture upon a literal translation. He renders it, ‘Being content with the *portion* which God had dispensed to you.’ And Professor Chevalier follows him literally. But the primary and unquestionably proper meaning of ἐφόδια is not merely a portion, but a portion prepared for use on a journey—a ‘*viaticum*.’ Here,

then, it must mean the Eucharist plain and simple: the real food which the Christian traveller receives from his God, and which is here coupled with the hearing of the Word; the latter possibly used in the sense of Justin Martyr for the prayer of consecration; possibly, however, in a more general sense, for the hearing of the Scriptures.

But how does S. Clement come to use this word *ἐφόδια* for the Eucharistic food? It is no common word: it is not Scriptural; it does not occur in the New Testament anywhere; and the metaphor involved in it is by no means common. Yet it is introduced without comment or qualification by S. Clement, such as he would almost certainly have used if the idea had been his own and newly coined.

The fact is, however, that the word is not his own. It occurs in the sense of the *Viaticum of Life* both in the Liturgy of S. Mark and in that of S. James. Here are the two passages:—

‘We give Thee thanks, Master, LORD, and our God, for the reception of Thy holy, spotless, immortal, and heavenly mysteries, which Thou hast given us for the well-being, and sanctification, and salvation of our souls and bodies; and we pray and beseech Thee, good LORD and lover of men, to grant that the participation of the holy Body and precious Blood of Thine only-begotten Son, may be to faith that shall not be ashamed, to love unfeigned, to the fulfilment of piety, to the turning away of the enemy, to the keeping Thy commandments, *to a provision on our way to eternal life* (εἰς ἐφόδιον ζωῆς αἰωνίου), to an acceptable defence before the fearful tribunal of Thy CHRIST; by whom and with whom, &c.’—*Lit. of S. Mark*, p. 29. (Eng. edit. Neale.)

‘Again and again, and evermore in peace, let us make our supplications to the LORD. That the participation in His sanctification may be to us for the turning away of every evil thing, *for a viaticum of eternal life* (εἰς ἐφόδιον ζωῆς αἰωνίου), for the participation and gift of the HOLY GHOST.’—*Lit. of S. James*, p. 63.

Such, then, is the Liturgical meaning of ‘the *ἐφόδια* of God.’ Such, also, without doubt, is its meaning here. For if it be not so, and we are to accept the ordinary translation, notice how weak and vapid the sentence becomes; its mild beginning being so utterly discordant with the bold significance of the other clauses.

We now proceed to give the whole passage in S. Clement, and will then remark on the points of contact between it and the Liturgies:—

‘Being furnished with *the viaticum of God*, and sedulously paying attention to His words, we were enlarged (ἐκτενισμένοι) in your bowels, and His Passion (τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ) was before your eyes. Thus peace deep and soothing was given to all, and an insatiable yearning towards the performance of good deeds, and a full effusion of the Holy Spirit was upon all; and being full of holy counsel in good confidence (προθυμία), with pious trust (πεποιθήσεις), you stretched forth your hands to the Almighty God (ἐξερεῖναι

τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν παντοκράτορα Θεόν), supplicating Him to become propitious (ἰλεως), if at all you have sinned in ignorance (εἴτε ἄκοντες ἡμάρτετε). And there was a contest to you both by day and by night in behalf of all the brotherhood, that with mercy and conscience (μετ' ἐλέως καὶ συνειδήσεως) the number of His elect may be saved. Ye were sincere and without offence towards each other: not mindful of injuries. All sedition and all schism was an abomination to you; you grieved over the transgressions (παρὰπτώμασιν) of your neighbours; you esteemed their deficiencies your own; you were without repentance in the performance of all good works, being ready for every deed. Being adorned with all-virtuous and reverential conversation (σεβασμῶν πολιτείᾳ) ye performed all your offices (πάντα ἐπετελεῖτε) in the fear of Him: the injunctions and commandments of the LORD were written on the breadth of your heart. All glory and enlargement was given to you, and so was fulfilled that which is written:—"My beloved did eat and drink, he was enlarged and waxed fat, and he kicked."—1 S. Clem. ii. iii.

'Ye were enlarged in your bowels and His Passion was before your eyes—ἐστερνωμένοι ἦτε τοῖς σπλάγχνοις, καὶ τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ ἡ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ὑμῶν.'

How was the Passion of the LORD before the eyes of the Corinthian Christians, unless in the Eucharistic representation of it? He does not say in a general way 'the πάθη,' but 'the πάθηματα.' He will have them remember τῶν ζωοποιῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ σωτηρίου σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, κ.τ.λ. —(Lit. of S. James, 62.) Keep them before their mind's eye here, that hereafter they may receive the reward which eye hath not seen. This gives an adequate reason for their being ἐστερνωμένοι τοῖς σπλάγχνοις, which otherwise is not so apparent. Without an Eucharistic application the phrase seems too strong for its place. Between the ἐφόδια and the παθήματα we can well understand its force in an Eucharistic sense.

'Thus (he proceeds) peace deep and soothing was given to all—οὕτως εἰρήνη βαθεῖα καὶ λιπαρὰ ἐδίδοδο πᾶσιν.'

'Thus.' How 'thus'? Peace could not be given by the contemplation of the Passion, but by the participation in it. Notice the hiatus. The knowledge of the mystery (which is supplied by the Liturgy) fills this hiatus with the communion of the faithful, to which S. Clement could not allude before the catechumens. From this communion flowed the peace 'deep and soothing' which was given by GOD.

The adjectives βαθεῖα and λιπαρὰ, as applied to peace, seem very peculiar. What is a λιπαρὰ εἰρήνη? It looks as though the terms were quoted from some passage in which they bore a peculiar allusive meaning. The term λιπαρὰ especially, of which, perhaps, the literal meaning is 'fat,' directs us to a sacrificial connexion at once. Yet the word does not occur at all in the Liturgies of S. James, S. Mark, S. Clement, or S. Basil. Can any clue be given to its use anywhere in this sense? The words may be noted anyhow for future search.

And now comes the really strong part of the quotation. S. Clement, after mentioning the ardent longing (*πόθος ἀκόρεστος*) for good deeds—an applicable phrase to those whose love had been kindled by the reception of the Mysteries, but scarcely fitting the sober routine of daily life—proceeds to say that a ‘full effusion (*ἐκχυσίς*) of the HOLY SPIRIT was (*ἐγένετο*) upon all.’ At once we turn to the invocation of the HOLY GHOST in the Liturgies, and here, sure enough, is a most remarkable circumstance. For within the bounds of the Invocation and the Intercession, which are appended to it (about three pages) occur all the principal phrases and more than all the leading ideas of this passage in S. Clement. I say more than all the leading ideas, for the substance and position of these ideas in the Epistle occur in such a manner that they might almost do duty as an analysis of the more expanded diction of the Liturgy of S. James. One passage could not have been written without an acquaintance with the other. Here are the coincident passages in the Liturgy, first in their order:—

‘*Priest* (repeats thrice).—For Thy people and Thy Church *supplicate* (*ἱκετεύουσι*) Thee.

‘*People*.—Have mercy upon us, LORD GOD, *Father Almighty*.

‘Have mercy upon us, *God Almighty* (*ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*).

‘Have mercy upon us, O GOD, according to Thy great *mercy* (*ἐλεος*), and *send forth upon us*, and upon these proposed gifts Thy *all-holy Spirit*, the LORD and life-giving; sharer of the throne and of the kingdom with Thee, GOD and Father, and Thine only-begotten Son, consubstantial and co-eternal, Who spake in the Law and the Prophets and Thy New Testament, Who descended in the form of a dove on our LORD JESUS CHRIST in the river Jordan, and rested on Him, who descended upon Thy holy Apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues in the upper room of the holy and glorious Sion, at the day of Pentecost: *send down the same most Holy Ghost, Lord, upon us*, and upon these holy and proposed gifts, that coming upon them with His holy, and good, and glorious presence, He may hallow and make this bread the holy Body of Thy CHRIST.

‘*People*.—Amen.

‘*Priest*.—And this cup *the precious Blood* (*αἷμα τίμιον*) of Thy CHRIST.

‘*People*.—Amen.

‘*Priest*.—That they may be to those who partake of them for remission of sins and for eternal life, for sanctification of souls and bodies, *for bringing forth good works*; for the confirmation of Thy Holy Catholic Church, which Thou hast founded upon the rock of faith, that the gates of hell may not prevail against it; freeing it from *all heresy and scandals*, and from them that work wickedness, and preserving it till the consummation of all things. We offer them also to Thee, O LORD, for Thy holy places, which Thou hast glorified by the divine apparition of Thy CHRIST, and by the advent of Thine all-holy Spirit: especially for the glorious Sion the Mother of all Churches. And for Thy holy Catholic Apostolic Church throughout the world. Supply it, O LORD, even now, with the plentiful gifts of the HOLY GHOST. Remember, also, O LORD, our holy fathers and brothers in it, and the bishops. . . . Remember also, O LORD, every city and region. . . . Remember, O LORD, Christians voyaging, . . . our fathers and brethren. Remember, O LORD, the sick. . . . Remember, O LORD, every

Christian soul in trouble and distress. . . . Remember, O LORD, all for good; *have pity, LORD, on all; be reconciled to all of us* (πᾶσιν ἡμῖν διαλλάγηθι); give peace to the multitude of Thy people; dissipate scandals; put an end to wars; *stay the rising up of heresies; give us Thy peace and Thy love, O God, our Saviour. . . . Remember, LORD, them that bear fruit, and do good deeds in Thy holy Churches. . . . Remember, also, O LORD, . . . the deacons . . . grant them blamelessness of life . . . that they may find mercy and grace with all Thy saints . . . our ancestors and fathers, patriarchs, prophets, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith of Thy Christ.* Remember, LORD, the God of the spirits and all flesh, the orthodox whom we have commemorated, *from righteous Abel unto this day. . . . And direct, O Lord, in peace the ends of our lives, so as to be Christian and well-pleasing to Thee and blameless; collecting us under the feet of Thine elect, when Thou wilt, and as Thou wilt, only without shame and offence.* Through, &c.

Deacon.—And for the peace and stability of the whole world, . . . and for the people that stand around, and for all, both men and women.

People.—For all, both men and women.

Priest.—For which thing's sake, to us, also, as being good and the lover of men.

People.—Remit, forgive, pardon, O God, *our offences, voluntary and involuntary* (τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, τὰ ἐκούσια, τὰ ἀκούσια), in deed and in word, *by knowledge and ignorance; by night and by day; in mind and intention; forgive us all, as being good and the lover of men.*

Priest.—Through the grace and pity, and love, &c.—*Lit. of S. James, p. 52. (English.)*

There are very many points of contact here. We mark the principal ones by italics:—

EPISTLE.

οὕτως εἰρήνην βαθεῖα καὶ λιπαρὰ
ἐδίδοτο πᾶσιν καὶ ἀκώρεστος πόθος
εἰς ἀγαθοποιῶν, καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος
ἀγίου ἔκχυσιν ἐπὶ πάντας ἐγένετο· μεστοί
τε ὁσίας βουλῆς ἐν ἀγαθῇ προθυμίᾳ μετ'
εὐσεβοῦς πεποιθήσεως ἐξετείνετε τὰς
χερίας ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν παντοκράτορα
Θεὸν ἱκετεύοντες αὐτὸν ἵλεως γε-
νέσθαι εἴτε ἄκοντες ἡμάρτετε.
Ἄγων ἦν ὑμῖν ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς
ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος, εἰς τὸ
σώζεσθαι μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδή-
σεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν
αὐτοῦ (.. ἐπὶ τοῖς παραπτώμασιν,
κ.τ.λ.)

LITURGY.

ὁ γὰρ λαὸς σου καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία σου
ἱκετεύουσί σε. . . Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ
Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. . . Ἐλέησον
ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεὸς, κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεος
σου. . . τὴν σὴν εἰρήνην χάρισαι
ἡμῖν. . . ἐπισυνάγων ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τοὺς
πόδας τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου. . . .
Ἄνες, ἀφες, συγχώρησον, ὁ Θεὸς, τὰ
παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, τὰ ἐκούσια
τὰ ἀκούσια· τὰ ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ, τὰ
ἐν γνώσει καὶ ἀγνοίᾳ· τὰ ἐν νυκτὶ
καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, κ.τ.λ.

This shows many of the verbal coincidences. Notice the use of that term ἵλεως in the Epistle. Surely if any word is distinctly and emphatically Liturgical as an epithet of the ALMIGHTY, it is this; ἱκετεύειν, too, and ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς literally transferred. The entreaty, too, for pardon for sins of ignorance so earnestly put forth in the Liturgy; here it is—εἴτε ἄκοντες ἡμάρτετε. The idea of the independent

efficacy of sins of ignorance, the inherent sinfulness of sin, we mean, independently of the mind which conceives it, is not so strongly and plainly taught in Holy Scripture as here. Not so plainly, anyhow, as to prevent Pelagius from claiming the support of Scripture for the opposite doctrine. But in the Liturgy forgiveness for such sins is exclusively implored in this prayer, and in the Epistle S. Clement alludes to such alone and none other. This is surely strong evidence. Then, in both the same key-note is struck about the good works. In both, the same word, *παραπτώματα*, is used for sins. In both, heresy and schism are earnestly deprecated. In both *εἰρήνη* and *ἔλεος*. In both the brotherhood of the faithful is specified as the object of intercessory prayer.

'There was a contest to you both by day and night in behalf of all the brotherhood.'—*Ep. of S. Clem.*

'And in behalf of the people who stand around, and in behalf of all, both men and women. (People respond.) In behalf of all, both men and women.'—*Liturgy of S. James.*

Neither is it without significance that the mention of Abel follows both passages. In the Liturgy memorial is made of him as one of the holy dead. In the Epistle there is an allusion to his sacrifice. There is, therefore, no similarity in the reference. Still the fact is noteworthy in combination with the other evidences.

To turn to another Father.

The writings of S. Justin Martyr court the most careful investigation. Born within the lifetime of the last Apostle, and himself the pupil of those who drew their teaching from apostolic lips, this great Confessor may well be allowed to rank with the Apostolic Fathers as an authoritative witness to Church doctrine. And the more his writings are sifted the more he will be found to be, beyond all dispute and question, a witness equally to the fact of the Liturgies. Yet one would not at first sight expect this. His great writings are not in the first instance designed for Christians. His apologies are addressed to the heathen: his Dialogue with Trypho to the Jews. To both of these the Liturgies were a sealed book. Not to such was it granted to catch with yearning ear the first accents of the voice of adoration within the veil, which were the signal of departure to those who unbaptized, yet obedient, awaited the hour of their illumination. In spite of this, however, such evidence is not wanting. S. Justin knew that the faith of the Church could not be adequately explained without an exposition, however elementary, of her ritual, which is at once its casket and its conductor. This ritual he describes openly and avowedly in the famous

passage in his First Apology (chap. 66, 67), wherein he gives the account, with which we are all so familiar, of the Eucharistic celebration. He also alludes, in an unmistakable manner, to the substance of the Prayers themselves in several places. And, unless we are much deceived, he quotes solely and pointedly one particular Liturgy, that Liturgy being the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions—the Liturgy of S. Clement. This adherence to one particular Liturgy is exactly what we should expect to find as marking the difference between S. Justin's quotations and those of the Apostolic Fathers. The streams have now left the common channel. The dwellers on the banks of each draw from their own stream; being out of view of the kindred waters which, each now in his own course, are fertilizing the Delta of the Church. It is for us to visit all in turn, and, drawing from each what it casts up in common with its fellows, to pronounce without doubt that this is a product of the parent stream.

In the following passage of the thirteenth chapter of the First Apology (page 32, Otto), S. Justin is contrasting the heathen sacrifices with the Christian. He says that we do not burn our sacrifices as they do, but consume it ourselves.

“We praise Him,” says he, “to the best of our power (*ὅση δύναμις αἰνοῦντες*), with the word of prayer and of thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίας*) in all our oblations.”

And then proceeds actually to give the very substance of the Prayer of Oblation in these words:—

“In speech we offer Him solemn acts of worship and hymns (*πρόμνας καὶ ὕμνους*) for our creation, for all our means of health, for the qualities (*ποιότητων*) of things, and for the changes of seasons, and we put up petitions that we may again be in incorruptibility (*τοῦ πάλιν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ γενέσθαι*) through our faith in Him. And the Teacher of these things, born even for that purpose, JESUS CHRIST, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the Procurator of Judæa in the time of Tiberius Cæsar, we having learnt to be the Son of the Very God, and holding Him in the second place, and the Prophetic Spirit in the third rank, evidently worship with reason (*μετὰ λόγου*).”

Notice the order of the Petitions:—

1. For our creation.
2. For all our means of health.
3. For the qualities of things.
4. For the changes of seasons.
5. For our restoration to incorruptibility, through faith in CHRIST.

Then follows the commemoration of the birth and life of CHRIST, and His death under Pilate.

Now compare them with the Anaphora of the Liturgy of S. Clement. We write out the latter, putting S. Justin's own words in the margin. Whenever we omit, we do so for the sake of

brevity, marking the *lacuna* by dots : but we only omit *amplifications* upon the preceding clause, not foreign matter.

ANAPHORA OF S. CLEMENT.

P. 77 (English).

'*Bishop*.—Lift up your mind.

'*People*.—We lift it up unto the LORD.

'*Bishop*.—Let us give thanks to the LORD.

'*People*.—It is meet and right.

'*Bishop*.—It is indeed meet and right before all things to hymn Thee, the Very God from everlasting, of Whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, Who alone art unbegotten, without beginning, the supreme LORD, Almighty King, and Self-sufficient: Author and Giver of all good things, without cause, without generation, self-existing, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. At Thy word, as from a necessary original, all things started into being. For Thou art everlasting knowledge, sight before all objects, hearing before all sounds, wisdom without instruction : the first in nature, the law of being, exceeding all number. Thou createdst all things out of nothing by Thine Only-begotten Son, begotten before all ages by no other means than Thy will, Thy power, and Thy goodness : God the Word, the Only-begotten Son, the living Wisdom, the First-born of every creature, the Angel of Thy great counsel, Thy High Priest, but LORD and King of all sensible and intellectual creatures, Who was before all things, and by whom all things were made. Thou, O Eternal God, didst make all things by Him, and by Him, too, dispensest Thy providence over them : for by the same that Thou didst graciously bring all things into being, by Him Thou continuest all things in well-being. . . . For it is Thou who hast fixed the heaven like an arch, and stretched it out like the covering of a tent ; and didst establish the earth upon nothing by Thy will alone. . . . Thou hast made water for drink, and for cleansing, the vital air for respiration. Thou madest fire for our consolation in darkness, and for the relief of our necessities, that we might be both warmed and enlightened by it. Thou didst divide the great sea from the land. . . . The former Thou hast replenished with small and great beasts, the latter, too, both with tame and wild : and hast, moreover, furnished it with various plants, crowned it with herbs, beautified it with flowers, and enriched it with seeds. Thou didst constitute the great deep . . . sometimes Thou dost swell it by the wind so as to equal the high mountains, and sometimes smooth it into a plain ; now making it rage with a tempest, then stilling it with a calm for the ease of mariners in their voyages. The earth, which was made by Thee, through CHRIST, Thou hast compassed with rivers, watered with currents, and moistened with springs which never fail. . . . Thou hast replenished and adorned it with fragrant and medicinal herbs, with many and various kinds of living creatures, strong and weak, for food and for labour, tame and wild ; with the dull harsh noises of those creatures which move upon the earth, and the soft sprightly notes of the gaudy many-coloured birds which wing the air : with the revolution of years, the number of months and days, the regular succession of the seasons ; with the courses of the clouds big with rain, for the production of fruits, the support of living creatures ; where, also, the winds take their stand which blow at Thy command, and for the refreshments of trees and plants. And Thou hast not only created the world, but man, likewise, the citizen of it : manifesting in him the beauty and excellency of that beautiful and excellent creation. For Thou saidst to Thine

In speech we offer Him solemn acts of worship and hymns ;

for our creation,

for all our means of health,

for the qualities of things,

for the changes of seasons,

Own wisdom, Let us make man in our own image and after our likeness. . . . Therefore Thou madest him of an immortal soul and perishable body; the soul out of nothing, the body of the four elements. . . . Thou didst plant a garden eastward in Eden. . . . Thou gavest him the privilege of enjoying all its delights, with this only exception, that he should not out of vain curiosity, in hopes of bettering his condition, taste of one tree, and immortality was to be the reward of his obedience to this command; but when he had broken through it and eaten of the forbidden fruit, overreached by the guile of the serpent and the counsel of the woman, Thou didst justly drive him out of Paradise; but in Thy goodness didst not despise him, nor suffer him wholly to perish, for he was the work of Thine own hands: but Thou gavest him dominion over all things. . . . And having subjected him for a while to a temporary death, Thou didst bind Thyself by an oath to restore him to life again, loosing the bands of that death by the promise of a resurrection to the life which is eternal.'

for our restoration to incorruptibility through faith in CHRIST.

Then follows a commemoration of the saints of the Old Testament: Abel, Enoch, Joseph, Moses, &c. &c., ending with a beautiful commemoration of the birth and life of CHRIST, and His death under Pilate.

'Holy is Thine Only-begotten Son JESUS CHRIST, our LORD and GOD, Who always ministering to Thee His GOD and FATHER, not only in the various works of the creation, but in the providential care of it did not overlook lost mankind. . . . He Who was man's Creator was pleased with Thy consent to become man: the Lawgiver to be under the law: the Priest to be Himself the sacrifice: the Shepherd a sheep. . . . He was incarnate of a virgin, GOD the Word, the beloved SON, the Firstborn of every creature. . . . He that was without flesh became flesh: He that was begotten from eternity was born in time. . . . He manifested Thy Name to them that knew it not: He dispelled the cloud of ignorance, restored piety; fulfilled Thy will, and finished Thy work which Thou gavest Him to do. And when He had regulated all these things. . . . He was by Thy permission delivered to Pilate the governor: the Judge of the world was judged.'

And so on in words which look very like an old original creed preserved within the structure of the Liturgy. Then follows this sentence:—

'Calling to remembrance, therefore, those things which He endured for our sakes, *we give thanks* unto Thee, O GOD ALMIGHTY, not to the extent of our duty, but to the best of our power (ὡχ ὅσον ὀφείλομεν ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα).'

This last sentence is clearly the original of S. Justin's assertion above quoted:—

'We praise Him to the best of our power with the word of prayer and of thanksgiving in all our oblations.'

A comparison of these passages quite satisfies us that the Liturgy supplies in itself the true rendering and significance of this same phrase when it occurs again in the great sixty-seventh chapter.

'"The celebrant sends forth," says S. Justin there, *'both prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his power* (ὡχ δύνανται αὐτῷ)."

It seems to mean neither extempore prayers, nor prayers from memory, nor prayers uttered with a loud voice, but prayers which he offers in the spirit of *δὴ δύναμις*: in this spirit in fact, 'Though we be unworthy through our manifold sins to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service,' &c.

And now, in turning to the famous sixty-fifth chapter of this First Apology, notice the order and arrangement, as well as the substance of the several parts of the Liturgy as there described. There can be no better description of the Liturgy of S. Clement. Everything is there which the Liturgy of S. Clement contains: nothing is given which is not to be found in that Liturgy. S. Justin gives a recapitulation in chap. 67 of the description of the celebration in chap. 65: the intervening chapter (66) being devoted to a parenthetical definition of the Eucharist itself. We give the order in the words of S. Justin, written out in a tabular form, for facility of reference and comparison:—

'S. JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apol.* i. chap. 65.

(Page 154, Otto; page 50, Oxford translation.)

Prayers for ourselves,

—— for the newly baptized,

—— for all others everywhere,

that we may be good citizens,

—— keep the commandments,

—— obtain everlasting salvation.

Kiss of Peace.

Elements brought—(bread, wine, and water).

Prayer of praise and glory to the FATHER through the SON and HOLY GHOST.

Thanks for being vouchsafed these things by Him.

Amen, by all the people in assent.

Communion.

Reservation by Deacons, for the sick.

Chap. 67. (Page 158, Otto; page 51, Oxford translation.)

Apostles and Prophets read.

Exhortation.

Rise and pray.

Elements brought—(bread, wine, and water).

Celebrant offers (*ἀναρέμει*) prayers and thanksgivings—(*δὴ δύναμις*).

Amen, by all the people in assent.

Communion.

Reservation by Deacons, for the sick.'

This chapter supplements the sixty-fifth in a very remarkable manner. It gives the reading of the lessons and the sermon which *preface* the Liturgy, and which are not noticed in the former chapter. We will now write out the order of the Liturgy of S. Clement, and you will see how exactly it tallies with this description. For facility of reference we give the pages in the little English edition (Hayes, 1859).

'LITURGY OF S. CLEMENT.

Apostles and Prophets read, p. 66.

Exhortation, p. 66.

Prayer for ourselves (Catechumens, Energumens, &c.), p. 67.

— for the newly baptized, p. 70.

— for all others everywhere, pp. 72—75.

Rise up : Bishop prays, p. 75.

Kiss of Peace, p. 76.

Elements brought—(bread, wine and water), Anaphora, p. 77.

Prayer of praise and glory.

1. To the FATHER (as Creator), pp. 77—84.

2. By the SON (words of Institution), p. 85.

3. Through the HOLY GHOST (Invocation), p. 86.

Amen, by all the people, p. 89.

Communion (each saying *Amen*), p. 89.

Reservation by the Deacons, in the *παστοφóρια*, p. 90.

Thanksgiving for being "vouchsafed to receive His holy mysteries," p. 90.

I ought to mention that, in chap. 67, S. Justin uses these words of the oblation :—

'In all our oblations we bless the Creator of all things, through His Son JESUS CHRIST, and through the HOLY GHOST.'

The evidence of these chapters may speak for itself ; nothing that we can say can strengthen it. It is fact—not theory.

We will select one more passage from the writings of S. Justin Martyr : this time from the 'Dialogue with Trypho.' S. Justin there quotes to Trypho the substance of one of those remarkable prayers at the commencement of S. Clement's Liturgy. There is a phrase in the sentence by which we very strongly suspect that the Liturgy is designated. It occurs in chapter xxx. of the 'Dialogue :—

'It is manifest to all that the word of the prophecy speaking in set form (*σχηματοποιήσας*) says, as from the person (*ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου*) of one of the faithful, that we who believe on Him pray Him to preserve us from the alien (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων*)—that is to say, from the evil and wandering—spirits. And we constantly implore (*παρακαλοῦμεν*) GOD through JESUS CHRIST that we may be preserved from those evil spirits which are aliens from the piety (*θεοσεβείας*) of GOD, and whom we formerly used to adore ; in order that after our turning to God through Him we may be blameless. For Him we call our Helper and Redeemer (*λυτρωτὴν*), at the power of whose Name even the evil spirits (*τὰ δαιμόνια*) tremble ; and being exorcised by us at this day in the Name of JESUS CHRIST, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the governor of Judæa, they are subjected to us ; from which it is plain to all that the FATHER gave Him so great power that even the evil spirits submit to His Name, and to the dispensation or (stewardship) of His Passion (*τῇ τοῦ γενομένου πάθους αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίᾳ*).

In this passage S. Justin describes a prayer. He speaks of it as of a thing actually existing, to which reference may be made in support of his argument with the Jew. He uses certain unusual expressions, which he qualifies or explains with a view

to their better comprehension by Trypho. Passing over the *σχηματοποίησας*, which may be worth investigation, we may notice the *ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου*, in which S. Justin evidently uses the *ἀπὸ προσώπου* in a technical sense, making its application here by the *ὡς* (which has puzzled his commentators not a little). It seems to fix to the celebrant the act, the nature and efficacy of which is derived from its identity with the sacrifice upon Calvary, and the continual presentation upon the heavenly altar.

We may look, then, for the occurrence of this expression in the Liturgy, as applied to CHRIST Himself.

Again, there is that very remarkable expression, '*the alien—the ἀλλότριος*,' as applied to the devil and his angels. It is evidently a peculiar title; for S. Justin goes out of his way to explain it—a thing which he would scarcely have done in the case of a word of his own invention or of ordinary use. This, then, we may expect to find in the Liturgy, if S. Justin be quoting it; and may also look for the terms '*evil and wandering spirits*,' by which he explains it.

With regard to the expression '*the stewardship of the Passion*,' more presently.

S. Justin also says that we call CHRIST '*our Helper and Redeemer*,' probably describing (in the words of Psalm xix. 14) some Liturgical appeal to our LORD in that character. He also says that the evil spirits are *exorcised by us at this day*. And here at once we put our finger upon the passage. This is the key—the door opens instantly, on the exorcism of the possessed in the Liturgy of S. Clement. Here it is:—

PRAYER FOR ENERGUMENS. LITURGY OF S. CLEMENT.

Page 69 (English).

'Deacon.—Pray ye that are troubled by unclean spirits.

'Let us all pray earnestly for them, that God, the lover of men, may through CHRIST rebuke the unclean and *evil spirits*, and may deliver His suppliants from the over-mastery of the alien. He that rebuked the legion of fiends and the primæval source of evil, the devil, let Him rebuke also now the apostates from piety (τοῖς ἀποστάταις τῆς εὐσεβείας, compare S. Justin above, ἀλλότρια τῆς θεοσεβείας), and preserve his own handiwork from the energy of Satan, and purify them whom with much wisdom He made. Furthermore, let us intently pray for them: save and raise them up, O God, in Thy power. Bend your heads, ye energumens, and receive the blessing.

'Bishop prays over them.—Thou that didst bind the strong man, and spoil his goods; Thou that didst give us power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and all the power of the enemy . . . whom all things shudder and tremble at from the person of Thy power (ἀπὸ προσώπου δυνάμεως σου) . . . Only-begotten God, SON of the mighty FATHER, rebuke the *evil spirits*, and deliver the works of Thy hands from the energy of the alien spirit: for to Thee is glory, honour, and worship, and by Thee to Thy FATHER and the HOLY GHOST. Amen.'

Notice that the Bishop's prayer here is not, as are the other prayers, addressed to the FATHER through CHRIST, but directly to CHRIST Himself. S. Justin's account, therefore, is strictly correct. The spirits were 'exorcised in the Name of CHRIST,' and the Prayer of exorcism is addressed immediately to Him. After these particular prayers for different classes of people, and immediately before the Kiss of Peace and the Anaphora, there occurs this general prayer for ourselves, and each other. Both Jebb and Otto have been before us in noticing the connexion between *this latter prayer* and the passage in S. Justin. (See Otto, page 99; Oxford translation, page 106.) It seems very strange that with this clue in their hands they went no further; strange, too, that even here, in quoting the passage, they omit what appear to be the strongest points of similarity. Here is the passage:—

LITURGY OF S. CLEMENT.

Page 74 (English).

'*Deacon*.—Let us pray for each other that the LORD may guard and preserve us by His grace unto the end, and may deliver us from the evil one, and from all the offences of them that work iniquity, and may save us to His heavenly kingdom—(very like the *débris* of the lost *embolismus* this).

'Let us rise up.

'Having earnestly made our supplication, let us commit ourselves and each other to the living God through His CHRIST.

'*Bishop prays over them*.—LORD ALMIGHTY, most highest, Thou that dwellest in the highest, . . . Thou who through CHRIST didst give us the preaching of knowledge, . . . do Thou Thyself now look down through Him upon this Thy flock, and *redeem* (λύτρωσαι) it from all ignorance and evil practices, and grant that it may entirely fear Thee, and perfectly love Thee, and may be bedewed from the person (ἀπὸ προσώπου) of Thy glory. Be Thou kind to them and propitious (ἱλεως) and affable in their prayers, and keep them without turning, without blame, without accusation, that they may be holy in body and in soul, not having spot nor wrinkle, nor any such thing; but that they may be perfect, and none among them may be incomplete. O Helper, Mighty, regarding not the persons of men, be Thou the Assistance of Thy people, whom Thou didst purchase with the precious blood of Thy CHRIST; Defender, Guardian, Steward, most secure Wall, Fence, Security, for none can pluck them out of Thine hands, nor is there any other god like Thee, for in Thee is our trust. Sanctify them in Thy truth, for Thy word is truth. Thou that art not to be flattered, Thou that art not to be deceived, deliver them from all sickness and all infirmity, from every fall, from all injury and deceit, from the fear of the enemy, from the arrow that flieth by day, from the thing that walketh in darkness: and vouchsafe to them the eternal life, which is in CHRIST, Thine Only-begotten Son, our God and SAVIOUR, through Whom,' &c.

These are the passages. Notice how S. Justin alludes to them. The manner in which he explains the meaning of the word ἀλλοτριῶν is very singular. He says:—

'Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν (τουτέστιν ἀπὸ τῶν πονηρῶν καὶ πλάνων) πνευμάτων.

'Alien' spirits mean, says he, 'evil and wandering' spirits. The word 'evil,' as applied to the spirits, occurs in the passage from the Liturgy given above. Just as the Ambrosian hymn speaks of *omnis errorum cohors*: and Prudentius of the *vagantes daemones*. The word 'wandering' (a rare word) is also applied by this same Liturgy to the devil in page 86, English; page 104, Greek:—

'That they may be delivered from the devil, and from his wandering (τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῦ).'

There is another thing worth notice. S. Justin says:—

'At the power of Whose Name even the evil spirits trembled (τὰ δαιμόνια τρέμει).'

The Liturgy says:—

'Whom all things shudder and tremble at from the person of Thy power.

'Ὅν πάντα φρίσσει καὶ τρέμει ἀπὸ προσώπου δυνάμεώς σου.'

The φρίσσει here is additional. It is, however, restored in a sentence, evidently bearing on this part of the Liturgy, in the 49th chapter of the Dialogue:—

'The hidden power of God was in the crucified CHRIST, whom both the evil spirits and all the powers and principalities of the earth shudder at.

'Κρυφία δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονε τῷ σταυρωθέντι Χριστῷ, ὃν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια φρίσσει καὶ πᾶσαι ἀπλῶς αἱ ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι τῆς γῆς.—*Dial. Trypho*, 49 (end).

There are other common allusions which merit notice; e.g. that of the evil spirits being 'subject to us' (S. Justin); 'under our power' (Liturgy).

Lastly, what is 'the dispensation of the Passion' (οἰκονομία τοῦ πάθους)? We cannot help thinking it possible that this may refer to the Liturgy itself through the Eucharist. We do not deny that the term οἰκονομία is used generally by the early Fathers sometimes to express the counsel of GOD in the Incarnation. Particularly, however, we think that it is distinctly applied to the Eucharist.

Thus S. Paul says:—

'A dispensation (stewardship, οἰκονομία) is committed to me.'—1 Cor. ix. 17.

And again, more definitely:—

'Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of CHRIST, and stewards (οἰκονόμους) of the mysteries of GOD.'—1 Cor. iv. 1.

Just as S. Peter speaks of—

'Stewards of the manifold grace of GOD.'—1 Pet. iv. 10.

And S. Paul, in addressing Titus, says:—

'A bishop must be blameless as the Steward of God.'—Tit. i. 7.

The epithet οἰκονόμος is applied to priests in the Liturgy. So in Lit. S. James, page 58 (Greek):—

'That we . . . being counted worthy to minister without guile at Thy altar may receive the reward of faithful and prudent stewards.'

But perhaps the most applicable of all the passages in which the word is used occurs in page 61 (Greek) of the Liturgy of S. James, immediately before the consecration: thus—

‘Who descended from heaven, and being incarnate of the HOLY GHOST and Mary the Virgin and Mother of God, and having had His conversation with men, *accomplished all the dispensation* (πάντα ἀκονόμενε) for the salvation of our race (and being about to die took bread, &c.).’—Page 50, English.

There are, doubtless, plenty more passages to the same effect.

Now, S. Justin is here speaking about particular exorcisms on particular occasions. He does not say (what he might have said, of course, with perfect truth) that the power of the devil was broken once and for all upon Calvary; but he says that when we, by exorcism, take up the power of victory then won for the Church by our LORD, the devils are expelled by ‘the stewardship of the Passion.’ How do we expel them by the stewardship of the Passion, unless by that application of the Passion whereof we are stewards?

There are many passages which seem confirmatory of this. See, for instance, Apol. ii. 6, where S. Justin speaks again about the exorcisms; and compare the first part of the chapter, wherein S. Justin speaks of the work of the Father and of the Only-begotten Son, with the Liturgy of S. Clement (pages 97, 98, Greek).

In his 8th Section, Mr. Freeman says:—

‘If it be asked, however, whether an actual Creed, in something like its present form, however scanty, had place in the Liturgies before Nicene days, we cannot answer the question with certainty. On the whole, I incline to the belief that it had: chiefly for the following reasons. 1. The Eucharist being the *τέλος* of Baptism, the supreme occasion for exercising all Christian privileges, it is hardly conceivable that the “Credo” should have been so diligently inculcated on candidates, if it was not to be used in the Liturgy. And, 2. following the line of illustration adopted in this chapter, we seem to find our Lord Himself dictating an actual Creed for Eucharistic use, in the terms which the Church has ever employed. For immediately after His “new commandment,” and at the point at which (see p. 293) the Jewish service prescribed the “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One Lord,” He says to them, “Ye believe,” or “Believe ye, in God; believe also in Me: in My Father’s house, &c. . . . He will send the Comforter, which is the *Holy Ghost*.” It is difficult to question that this is the origin of the great formula, so familiar to us now, but heretofore unknown, “I BELIEVE in GOD, the FATHER; and in JESUS CHRIST, His ONLY SON; and in the HOLY GHOST.” Thus would our Lord Himself have been the first to put into the Church’s mouth her glorious Creed, and to proclaim at the very institution of Christianity its leading psychological verity, that “this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our *faith*.” And if it be objected that in this case we should rather have found the formula to be in the plural number, it is remarkable that in the earliest forms it was so. With one exception, no Creed has been found in the singular until the middle of the fourth century. And in the least changed of the Eastern rites, the Syriac, as well as in the Spanish, the eucharistic

recitation of the Creed runs in the plural, "Credimus." In other Churches, the catechumenical system would seem to have had the effect of remanding the Creed for two or three centuries to baptismal use. Hence, when it was reinstated at the period of the Nicene Council, it returned, generally, in the singular number.

On the contrary, among the Liturgical fragments in the New Testament, there are some of Creeds.

And first: it will scarcely be denied that the opening paragraphs of the fifteenth chapter of the First of Corinthians contain the fragments of a Creed. Be it remembered that S. Paul had a certain 'form of sound words'—in other terms, an orthodox confession of faith,—which he committed to his infant Churches. Of such a form he is reminding the Corinthians: 'The gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; if ye *keep in memory* what I preached unto you, unless ye have *believed* in vain.' What are the articles of this form?

'CHRIST died for our sins according to the Scriptures;
And was buried,
And rose again the third day according to the Scriptures;
And was seen of Cephas,
Then of the twelve;
After that of above five hundred brethren.
After that, of James.
Then of all the Apostles.'

Compare this with the Pauline Exposition of the Faith, as given to the Jews. (Acts xiii. 26, *seq.*)

Article 1.—'CHRIST died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.'

'*Commentary.*—(Suggested by the article as it presented itself to the Apostle's mind.)

'Unto you is the word of salvation sent.

'They that dwell at Jerusalem, *because they knew . . . not . . . the voices of the prophets* which are read every Sabbath-day, have fulfilled them.'

Article 2.—'And was buried.'

'*Commentary.*—They took Him down from the Tree, and laid Him in a sepulchre.'

Article 3.—'And rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.'

'*Commentary.*—But God raised Him from the dead.'

Article 4.—'And was seen of Cephas,' &c.

'*Commentary.*—And He was seen many days of those that came up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem.'

Surely this is not a mere coincidence of sequence:—and it is remarkable that neither in the Creed, nor in the Sermon, is there any reference to the Ascension.

Let us now put the Petrine Exposition of Faith in juxtaposition with the Pauline.

S. PAUL.

'If ye keep in memory what I preached unto you.

CHRIST died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.

And was buried.

And rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.

And was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve,' &c.

S. PETER.

'That word, I say, ye know.

GOD anointed JESUS of Nazareth with the HOLY GHOST, and with power.

Who went about doing good.

Whom they slew and hanged on a tree.

Him GOD raised up the third day.

And shewed Him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of GOD, even unto us.

He was ordained to be the judge of quick and dead.

Whosoever believeth in Him shall receive the remission of sins.'

These may be compared with a passage in the Acts of S. Ignatius (a passage which well supplies a missing link in the Creeds which we have quoted from the Epistles).

The emperor, immediately before condemning S. Ignatius, is interrogating the saint about his faith. The replies of the saint are directed not so much to the emperor as to the Christians who are standing by. Indeed, his wording of the expression, 'bearing CHRIST within his breast,' seems to have induced the emperor at once to sentence him as a fanatic. S. Ignatius allowed Trajan to understand his words in a sense different from that which they conveyed to the Christians. 'Who is Theophrus?' said Trajan. 'He,' replied S. Ignatius, 'who has CHRIST in his breast.' 'And do not we,' said the emperor, 'then seem to thee to have the gods within us, who fight for us against our enemies?' 'You err,' said S. Ignatius, 'in that you call the evil spirits of the heathen, gods. For' (here, if ever, is the place for a Creed—the grand confession of CHRIST's soldier)—

"There is one GOD who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that are in them;—

"And one JESUS CHRIST, His only-begotten SON, whose kingdom may I enjoy."

'His kingdom,' replied Trajan, 'you say, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate.' 'His,' continued S. Ignatius, 'who crucified my sin,' and so on (condemned for saying that he carried the Crucified within him). This passage seems to me to bear importantly on the Apostolic hymn in Acts iv. 24.

Mr. Freeman is, we think, very happy in his speculations on the possible rise of the Ephesine Liturgy :—

‘ Over and above the original communications to the Twelve, whether at the Last Supper, or in the forty days, or at Pentecost, there was an independent fount of liturgical knowledge and rule which sprang up in the bosom of the great Pentecostal Church. I speak, of course, of the revelation made on this subject to the Apostle S. Paul. We are distinctly assured by him that the *liturgical* traditions and rules which he “delivered” to the Churches he had personally “received of the LORD.” (1 Cor. xi.) In this as in other respects he conferred not with flesh and blood, nor with them that were Apostles before him, but imparted independently his own “tradition.” That that tradition would accord, in all leading features, with the already received rule of the Church, we might be well assured. But it was, at the same time, most probable that the fervent and energetic soul of S. Paul would fuse into some peculiar form, and stamp with some special character and mintage, the rites which he delivered. And though we could not in the least have conjectured beforehand what that stamp would be, it must be admitted that the peculiarities of the rite now under consideration accord sufficiently well with the known characteristics of his mind and teaching. It is to this great Apostle that the Scriptural exhibition of Christianity owes its fulness, its variety, its cosmopolitan adaptation. For him the love of all ages, Jewish or classical, historical or ritual, moralist or spiritual, was a storehouse whence he drew materials to build up and adorn the fabric of gospel truth. Above all, personal appeal, oral communication, or “preaching,” was the special weapon of his ministry. That a *liturgical* exhibition of the same great system of verities should present these same characteristics of richness, varied method, and homiletic teaching, is strongly in favour of the supposition of its having proceeded from him.

‘ Nor are we without strong presumptive proof, derived from his own writings, that it was indeed he who originated and exclusively employed a *variable* method of Eucharistic celebration. In a well-known passage, which the best writers have agreed to interpret ritually, he says, “When thou shalt bless” eucharistically “with the spirit,” *i.e.* “in a rapture and in an unknown tongue, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say the accustomed ‘Amen’ (το ἀμὴν) to thy giving of thanks or eucharistic blessing, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou indeed givest the eucharistic blessing well, but the other is not edified.” Now the state of things here implied—that is, a Eucharistic office in a condition of flux and *ad libitum* variety as to its prayer of consecration—is one which the existing phenomena of all other offices in East and West not only give no hint of, but forbid us to suppose can ever have had place in those rites. If, as some imagine, the Eucharistic forms were at the first variable at the pleasure of the celebrant, what has become of them all? How is it that every known rite but this has its *one* consecration prayer, and no more?

‘ The Spanish and French Offices, on the other hand, agree in having exactly such a varying consecration prayer as S. Paul seems to refer to. It is further remarkable that the one rite in the world which, on the whole, delivers, with slightest variation, S. Paul’s form for the words of Institution, is no other than the Spanish; the Gallican is unknown to us. And may we not remark, as regards the rubrical peculiarities of these rites, that S. Paul continually gives directions which may well have led to the use of the *imperative* form in the rite delivered by him?

‘ On the whole, the probability that S. Paul, and none other, since ~~xxxx~~

else was in a position to do so, originated the "Ephesine" type of liturgy, is very considerable. That it should bear sway at Ephesus more especially is exactly what we might expect from the long and close connexion of the Apostle with that city and neighbourhood. It is true that the Churches which received this rite traced it uniformly to S. John; but this is easily accounted for, and resolves itself, in fact, into the same view. For S. John, as having presided over the Churches about Ephesus after S. Paul was removed from the scene, would naturally be referred to as the author of the Liturgy which went forth from thence, whether by the hands of Irenæus or of yet earlier evangelizers in France or Spain, Britain or Ireland.

'Some surprise may indeed be felt that we should find no trace of this Liturgy in any other of the Churches founded in the East by S. Paul, especially at Corinth, to which he had certainly imparted it originally. But the influence of the patriarchal sees in suppressing other rites than their own will sufficiently account for it.'

We cannot but wonder that our author passes so very slightly and superficially over the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST, and the Eastern and Western controversy regarding it. His own view is that of the Western Church. We hope, at some future period, to be able to investigate the question at length, and to show that the Roman, no less than the Eastern, Liturgy originally possessed it, though it was dropped, probably through African influence, at a very early period.

On another point, too, we are quite at variance with our author—in his assumption that our LORD did not eat the Passover. It may be matter of discussion how there could be two passovers—whether it were arbitrarily anticipated by our LORD; or that He merely followed an ancient and orthodox party in eating it on the beginning of the 14th of Nisan (concerning which Mr. Freeman offers no argument, but only says, 'it is simply incredible'); or, as Petavius (and the writer agrees with him), that in this year there was a disputed Passover, just as in the early Church there were disputed Easters; GOD so ordering it that the SAVIOUR might change the old into the new rite, and yet give up the ghost at the very time that the Paschal Lamb was slain. That disputed Passovers did sometimes occur, we know; and while the original polity of Israel remained unchanged, the Tribe of Issachar determined the day, just as the Church of Alexandria issued the notice of Easter. And to this they refer the blessing of Moses: 'Rejoice . . . Issachar, in thy tents: *they shall call the people to the mountain.*' and again, 1 Chron. xii. 22: 'of the children of Issachar, *which were men that had understanding of the times, and knew what Israel ought to do.*' No: it is a disappointing theory, which would contradict some of the noblest uninspired words ever written.

'In supremæ nocte cœnæ
 Recumbens cum fratribus
Observata lege plene
Cibis in legalibus
 Cibum turbæ duodenæ
 Se dat suis manibus.'

We cannot, before concluding, deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting one of the most beautiful Eucharistic passages we ever remember to have read:—

'Nothing is more striking to the thoughtful reader of Holy Writ than the profound air of *sadness*—the unutterable pathos—which breathes through the entire Eucharistic narrative, and through S. John's exhibition of it more especially. Compare in this respect the presentation of this greatest and most acceptable of all burnt-offerings with that of any memorable one of elder days, as Solomon's or Hezekiah's; observe the *jubilant* feelings associated with such occasions of old time, and with the Church's celebrations ever since: and the contrast is most remarkable. The truth is, that the Apostles had at length realized, what they had so long put from them, that "the Son of Man was about to be delivered into the hands of men, and to be crucified." And yet, while their faith in Christ's words reached to this, it reached apparently no further. That He should rise again the third day, and that then His Death should be the Life of the world; this, as the after events proved, was as far from their conception as ever. The attitude of their minds, therefore, was one of unmingled sorrow. And this sorrow was summed up in a sense of impending *bereavement*. He for Whom they had left all, and Who was to them father and mother and kindred and home, was about to leave them desolate. Stunned by that one grief, they seemed incapable of any other feeling.

'In what character then should He consider them, in presenting to their view His saving work, so as effectually to meet and console this feeling? None surely could be conceived more suitable than that in which they had been accustomed, in the weekly recurring Sabbath-eve ritual, to view themselves. It will be remembered that the cup of wine, in the Synagogue service, was given to the *little children*, who stood round for the purpose; and further, that the response to the "grace," or "consecration," was said by an *orphan*. Now whence this singular provision? It was doubtless because the nation had been taught to view their condition in Egypt as one of orphanhood and desolation. In the great Psalm which especially embodies the national feeling on this point (the 68th) we read:—"A Father of the orphans, and a defender or advocate of the widows, is God in His holy habitation. . . . God makes the solitary to dwell in houses, He brings the prisoners to prosperity." They were taught again, to remember, that "they were strangers in Egypt;" therefore "they were not to afflict any widow or fatherless child." On the weekly recurring eve, therefore, of the day of their deliverance, they are in like manner represented as orphans and desolate. And this is the reason why *wine* was the more especial, and in the synagogue the *sole* "outward visible sign" in this memorial action; though in the household ritual bread was also employed. For so was the national and Oriental custom to give to mourners, and especially to orphans, the "cup of consolation for father and for mother;" and thus to "comfort them under their loss." "Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to those that be of heavy hearts; let him drink, and remember his misery no more." However, bread was also given for the same purpose,

and has place accordingly in the domestic rite. But the expression to "break bread" was appropriated, as it should seem, to eleemosynary giving of it, including specially the case of children and of mourners. It never means taking an ordinary meal, but giving food to the sad or destitute; as, *e.g.* "neither shall men break bread for them in mourning;" "The young children ask bread, and no man breaketh it to them." It was, then, as orphans brought out of Egypt that the Israelites were taught to appear week by week before God. It was out of that profoundest depth that they were to lift up their hearts to God in the "height of the uppermost heavens." As a commentator on Psalm lxviii. most appositely says,—though unconscious of what is here pointed out—"‘*Sursum corda*’ is for the fatherless." In a perfectly parallel manner does our Lord adopt, throughout His whole discourse, the strain of *consolation*; and that too as towards *orphans*: actually calling them by that name; addressing them in His very first words as "little children;" speaking of God as the FATHER forty times in His discourses, and six times in His prayer; soothing their sorrow, and promising a place in His Father's House, and the presence of more than one Comforter; "breaking to them the bread" of mourners, and "giving them to drink the cup" of consolation. This He did, both as balm for their present bereavement, and as a pledge of His restoration to them by His coming again.

We have not attempted, as the reader perceives, to give any analysis of this work. Its condensed thought would have rendered this impossible. We have rather followed out one or two particular trains of thought suggested by it. We may not, and do not, agree with all its theories; but it is absolutely indispensable to all Liturgical scholars, and will take its rank with Mabillon's 'Gallican Liturgies,' or Bona's great work, while in style it soars high above them. We congratulate the Church of England on receiving such a gift from one of her priests; and we congratulate Mr. Freeman on the happy retrospect which he must take of the fifteen years employed in the performance of his now finished task.

- ART. VIII.—1. *Proceedings¹ of the Church Congress held at Oxford July 8th, 9th, and 10th, 1862.* London and Oxford: Parker, 1862.
2. *Reports and Correspondence in the 'Guardian' Newspaper, from the 9th to the 30th July, 1862.*
3. *Deaconesses; or, the Official Help of Women in Parochial Work and in Charitable Institutions.* By the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. London: Longman. 1862.
4. *Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy.* By MARGARET GOODMAN. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1862.
5. *The Duties of Deacons and Priests in the Church of England, compared, &c. &c.* By WILLIAM HALE HALE, M.A., Archdeacon of London. London: Rivingtons. 1850.
6. *Suggestions for the Extension of the Ministry, and the Revival of the Order of Sub-deacons, in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of London, May 24, 1852.* By WILLIAM HALE HALE, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1852.

THE 'voluntary principle,' as generally understood, means the principle of free-will offerings, as opposed to funds derived from taxation or endowment; but we may well extend its significance to include spontaneous organization, as distinct from that provided by constitutional forms. And both, indeed, rest on the same grounds ultimately, as regards the wants of the general body within whose bosom they arise. For, as it is hardly possible, nor perhaps desirable, that there should exist a sufficiency of funds, arising from defined and regularly accruing resources, to meet all the demands on a body in which perpetual extension is the condition of its vitality; so it is similarly difficult to imagine a fully adequate constitutional organization, qualified to promote and regulate the action of a society in which the mere increase of population, and the proportionate complexity of social relations thereon ensuing, is ever multiplying calls for concerted action and divided labour. This is the more obvious when the body in question is a national Church, bearing in its

¹ These only reached our hands in the proof-sheet after a large part of this article had gone to press. Quotations are mostly given as reported in *The Guardian*, unless any obvious inaccuracy has been observed on comparing its report with that of the 'Proceedings.'

bosom the spiritual wants of a people; and it becomes a paramount necessity, when we consider the case of a nation so diffusive and restless as our own; in which not only fresh draughts are perpetually made on the home population by the colonies and by general emigration, but in which the old centres of population at home are perpetually shifting, displacing the *fulcra* and modifying the forces, on the adjustment of which the efficacy of organization depends. As regards individuals, indeed, the duty of free-will offerings on other and higher grounds will never cease; but as regards the needs of the whole body, spontaneous forms of deliberative action are as much called for as the material resources derived from the charity which thinks not of endowments, and waits not to be taxed.

But when we consider the actual position of the Church of England, and the hampered relations with the State under which she labours, such forms of free-will organization as the Congress of the present and the previous year are an indispensable condition of healthy action and vigorous growth. They show that she has burst from the trammels which grew up during a period of torpor, and that the springs of corporate action are escaping from under the dead weight which the eighteenth century laid upon them. But, apart from this bearing on constitutional questions, the wholesome effect to the clergy of such unauthoritative but influential meetings is great, and its weight should be allowed. The march of tendencies is in the present day towards the substitution of influence for authority. This must be the case in most bodies where subordination exists, in proportion as intelligence becomes diffused and circulates through the obedience rendered. In most, but not in all, the extent to which implicit regard is paid to external law tends ever to recede; and the area of compliance, resting on a subjective estimate of measures, and still more of men, tends to enlarge. The strength of opinion where discussion has been had, or might have been, is often greater precisely for the reason that no one is positively bound to bend to it. It provokes no resistance, it commits no one, and cuts off no one's retreat from an untenable position; but it gives an unmistakable warning, and mostly, if well organized, an ample notice, and leaves those who will not take it, not to legally enacted penalties, but to the natural consequences of isolation, or the chance, it may be, of a turn of tide in their favour. Those who put their trust in formularies, canonical regulations, and visitations, will probably see little else than a shadow in the best attended and most impartially recruited Congress; still, when the shadow is traversing the dial, and indicating the hour, it is, if one may say it without paradox, more directly important than the substance;

and such is the influence of such gatherings as compared with *ex cathedra* authority.

Nor should we omit the peculiar value of such periodical meetings to the clergy of our Church, who labour under more isolation than does them good, and contract the stiffened habits of official solitude. The merit of such an institution in this respect is, that it circulates opinion without centralizing its force, or giving even to a majority any right to dictate. It enables the researches of the thoughtful theorist and the experience of the man practised in affairs to check each other, and makes both mutually corrective, more available for general use, and intrinsically more valuable than either or both would otherwise be; while to the general mass of men, who go each by his own parish clock, it becomes a most useful regulator. It is a good thing for those who have laboured half a lifetime, without a hint from any, save those who addressed them by formal right of office, to have a chance of cracking their crust, and rubbing down their asperities, and being reclaimed from their semi-fossil state. We read something about 'iron sharpening iron,' but till some unevennesses are redressed, there is no chance for a great many of receiving either edge or polish.

The power of healthy life, as in the physical frame, finds for itself fresh channels where the old ones are ossified or clogged, until the glow of sympathy and the friction of activity rouse in these also a resumption of vital action. So far from superseding or being a substitute for synodical functions, such a Congress as this merely proclaims more unmistakably their necessity, and prepares the way for their full restoration. The free expression of opinions in debate, albeit in form extraneous to the constitution, shows better than anything else how far existing means and machinery suffice, and indicates precisely the point at which they fall short. Where adequate synodical organization exists, such subsidiary organization best insures a regular supply of material for it to work upon; where it does not exist, this latter is the most fitting stimulus towards procuring it.

Nor need we pause to answer at length the objection which has been urged, that the essays read on various momentous subjects by men of responsible position and acknowledged ability would have had an effect equally valuable had they been published as pamphlets or tracts. It argues little knowledge of human nature to hold such language. Nothing written merely for publication by the press carries with it the instinctive consciousness of reality on the part of the writer, which he feels who knows that his views are to be projected at once into the arena of instant living criticism. The best and oldest form of publication is by the voice of him who has studied in solitude, and

thought out single-minded, what he is to propound to a perfectly free assembly, armed with the weapons of discussion. The press confers a wider range, but the assembly insures a closer incidence and a more brisk collision. The pamphlet may be a powerful missile, but the debate brings men hand to hand. A pamphlet may include sophistry to beguile the unwary, but a speech or recited essay calls up the most capable in the assembly where it is delivered, to defend the weaker brethren from being misled. The winnowing process goes on at once when free debate begins; and when it is over, the result remains in a permanent form. The paper read may reappear as a pamphlet, but it comes from the press no more as a shaft sent at a venture, but with a tested character and an accredited weight.

These general arguments will apply to all such meetings, and the objections, frivolous, though plausible, as they are, have been, in fact, applied to various forms of Church organization. It has, for example, been proposed to work a diocese on paper, and the proposer was, we believe, a man of no less mark than the late Sir James Graham; and so, by enlarging the application of the principle, we might have an entire ecclesiastical government carried on upon the silent system, leaving the talking to be done in the Houses of Parliament. Those who hold such views may probably regard the Congress as either unmeaning or dangerous. The spring of growth which the Church has lately taken promises speedily to shut such views out of sight, and overshadow the sneerers and croakers who find an expression, at present, in the leading articles of *The Times*.

There are some considerations which we ought not to omit in estimating the importance of their occasion. The increase of Church feeling in the country and of Church influence in the Legislature, which have marked the late and present as compared with previous sessions, has had its weight in enhancing the attractions of such a gathering. This increase has been far more general than many of us have had any notion of, and the apparent gain of outward strength is of even far less value than the consolidation of the people's heart around the oldest and most sacred institution of the land. An awakened intelligence has brought this blessing in its train. There was a time when education was feared by many, as likely to loosen the bands which knit the mass of the nation to the ancient centre of spiritual teaching. The result, as traceable, is simply this, that an enlightened and discerning preference has replaced the mere *vis inertiae* of habit and the blind prejudice engendered by tradition. The common sense of a larger portion of educated Englishmen gives less and less hold to the demagogue, and offers a surer basis for the support of the Church. No wonder

that such a result should have its manifest tokens in such a Congress as that of last July.

Nor ought we to omit, in taking account of the special popularity of this meeting, the great attractions of the University itself, and the high intellectual gratification sure to present itself in an assembly, for whatever purpose met, presided over by the Bishop of Oxford. This interest, on personal grounds, was augmented by the occasion—one certain to place its president in the very focus of those sympathies which tend, beyond anything else, to draw out the oratorical and reflective qualities with which the Bishop is endowed. There is also observable a growing tendency on the part of the laity to find for themselves utterance in these debates. They are feeling their way to an attitude in which their voices on Church questions may obtain constitutional expression, and seem more and more drawn to any organization which ensures them their proper place and functions. No Church can ever, in the present day, stand, as a clerical corporation, on the basis of a mere establishment founded on parliamentary enactment and endowment. The revived interest taken by the laity in all Church questions, *because they are such*, is a result which, long and steadily as events have been preparing for it, may be now regarded as achieved; and it is the one indisputable pledge of vitality which contains all other securities in itself. Where this exists all other barriers are safe, and where this is lost nothing else will save. We shall have occasion to exhibit this fact in some detail as we touch on some of the discussions which took place. For the present we may observe, generally, that it is precisely because the Congress opened so wide a door to the gratification of this feeling, that its numbers were so large, its interest so sustained and genuine; that so much of practical wisdom, so little comparatively of divided opinion, and such a total absence of discord or irritation, marked the discussion of all questions—many of them of extreme delicacy—which there were raised. As regards the last fact, we believe it will generally be found to characterise any assembly where clergy and laity are consciously present as such. Each keeps something of a watch upon himself as well as upon his brother, and the standard of behaviour is raised for the whole.

It would not be consistent either with our limits of space or our purpose as reviewers, to give what could properly be called an abridgment of the debates on the subjects dealt with. It will rather be our object to interpret their tendency and present a digest of their results, showing, however, what views were held on the most important topics, and throwing on the arguments adduced any collateral light which may occur. However,

that the reader may have a correct view of the number and quality of the subjects handled, we here subjoin a list of them, and of the speakers who addressed the Congress on each. We premise that the Congress was held in the Sheldonian Theatre, at Oxford, and the evening sittings, owing to the difficulty in respect of lighting that building, in the Town-hall. In the theatre, the President, the Bishop of Oxford, occupied the Chancellor's chair; the members of the Episcopal order, who were present, being seated nearest to him, together with the Archdeacons and persons of 'dignified' position. The rest of the semicircle was tenanted by any who chose to signify to the secretaries their wish to speak, while the openers of each question spoke or read from the lecturers' desks at either end of the semicircle. The meetings were opened by the President with prayer, who, in commencing the proceedings of the Congress, said:—

'The object of such a gathering is plain, I think, to every one. It does not interfere with any of the constituted modes of the Church's previous deliberation or action; it does not cross the path, for instance, of the Convocation of either of its provinces; it professes to have no sort of deliberative authority even, still less to come to any conclusion which can bind in any degree any one who attends it; its purpose is altogether diverse from those authorized gatherings of our body. It is to discuss together, in the spirit of friendly questioning, some of the great subjects on which depends the advance of our Church in her great work for God—of leavening this people, and through this people the world at large so far as it can be reached, with the principles and practices of the Divine revelation of our Lord.'

The enumeration of subjects and speakers is as follows:—

Tuesday, July 8th.

Morning.—General Subject, Clerical Education.

1. The Education of the Clergy.—Paper read by Dean Ellicott.
2. Clerical Education in connexion with the Universities.—Paper read by Rev. E. A. Litton.

Speakers, Rev. Dr. Baylee, of Birkenhead Theological College; Rev. F. C. Cook, Inspector of Schools, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn; Rev. C. A. Swainson, Chichester Theological College; Archdeacon Denison; Rev. H. Swinny, Cuddesden Theological College; Mr. Allen, a medical practitioner from Norwich; Rev. C. R. Conybeare; Rev. W. Belmont; Rev. E. C. Woolcombe; Rev. W. Emery. After whom the President summed up.

Afternoon.—General Subject, The Means of Enlarging and Supplementing Ministerial Agency.

1. The Increase of the Episcopate.—Opening speech by Mr. Beresford Hope.

Following Speakers, Archdeacon Churton, Rev. Dr. Baylee, Alderman Bennett, Rev. Mr. Finley, Rev. F. C. Massingberd, Archdeacon Denison, Rev. Brymer Belcher.

2. The Extension of the Ministry.—Paper read by Professor Harold Browne.
3. Regulated Lay Agency, or Minor Orders.—Paper read by Rev. F. C. Massingberd.

Following Speakers, Rev. P. Ward, Rev. C. Beamont, Mr. R. S. Sowler, Rev. Dr. Howson, Canon Woodgate, Rev. F. Trench,

Evening.—(Sectional.)

1. Women's Work in Workhouses.—Paper read by Professor Burrows, one of the Secretaries to the Congress.
2. Hospital Work.—Paper read by Dr. Acland, Regius Professor of Medicine.
3. Young Men's Institutes.—Paper read by Rev. J. Lawrell. After which the President summed up. An account of the Oxford Churchman's Union, by the Rev. W. Macray, could not be read for want of time.
4. The Church in the Army.—Paper read by Rev. W. F. Hobson Chaplain to the Forces.

Wednesday, July 9th.

Morning.—General Subject, Church Finance.

1. The Best Means of Raising Funds for General Church Purposes.—Paper read by Mr. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.
 2. The Best Means of Raising Funds for Local Purposes.—Paper read by Rev. T. L. Claughton.
- Following Speakers,* Archdeacon Denison, Mr. Francis Powell, Rev. F. Trench, Mr. C. L. Higgins, Mr. Sowler, Mr. Churchwarden Akroyd, Mr. Pierpoint, Dr. Hume, Mr. Brett, Mr. W. Cotton.

Afternoon.—General Subject, The Employment of Women in Works of Piety and Charity.

1. Deaconesses.—Rev. Dr. Howson.
 2. Sisters of Mercy.—Rev. T. T. Carter.
 3. Patristic Testimonies; and the Religious Sister in her Relations to the Parochial System.—Rev. Dr. Pusey.
 4. Parochial Mission Women.—Paper read by R. W. Furse.
- Following Speakers,* Rev. R. J. Hayne, Rev. Pelham Dale, Rev. R. Seymour, Rev. W. Scudamore, Archdeacon Churton. A concluding summary by the President.

Evening.—(Sectional.)

1. The Church of England abroad, and her relations to other Churches of Europe.—Paper read by Rev. F. Meyrick.
- Following Speakers,* Rev. G. Williams and Rev. E. A. Litton.
2. On the Best Means of Promoting the Legitimate Influence of the Church in the House of Commons.—Paper read by Right Hon Joseph Napier.
- Following Speakers,* Rev. J. S. Walters, Rev. C. Robins, Mr. H Hoare, Hon. F. Lygon, M.P.

Thursday, July 10th.

Morning.—General Subject, The Means of Recovering the Alienated Classes to the Church.

1. Free and Open Churches.—Paper read by Mr. E. Herford.
 2. School-chapels, and Supplemental Services.—Paper read by Rev. W Cadman.
- Following Speakers,* Mr. Hoare, Rev. Erskine Clarke, Rev. G. W. Proctor, Rev. H. Jones, Rev. G. Huntingdon, Rev. E. A. Litton, Lord Ebury, Archdeacon Clerke, The Mayor of Oxford, Sir Charles Anderson, Mr. Hubbard, M.P., Rev. James Skinner, Mr. Charles Higgins, Rev. C. M. Robins, Professor Burrows, Rev. F. C. Massingberd, Canon Trevor, Mr. Brett. A concluding summary by the Bishop.

Afternoon.—General Subject, Missions.

1. The Selection and Training of Missionaries.—Paper read by Rev J. Phillips.
 2. Foreign Missions.—Paper read by Rev. H. C. Huxtable.
- Following Speakers,* Rev. C. D. Goldie, Mr. C. Raikes, of the Indian Civil Service, Canon Trevor, Dr. Acland, Rev. Dr. Baylee, Rev. H. W. Burrows, the Bishop of Capetown.

Evening.—(Sectional.)

1. National Education.—Paper read by the Rev. W. R. Morrison.
2. Colonial Synods.—Speech by the Bishop of Tasmania.

Following Speakers, The Bishop of Capetown, the Right Hon. Joseph Napier. Some concluding remarks were made by the President, who pronounced the benediction, and declared the Congress dissolved.

It should be added that on Thursday morning a slight interpolation in the order of proceedings took place; Archdeacon Denison rising to embody in a resolution for the adoption of the meeting, the view with regard to vows for members of 'religious' institutions, which the President had expressed when that subject was discussed on the previous day. As regards the subject-matter of the resolution, we shall have occasion to return to it when discussing the general topic to which it refers; but the Congress inclined to waive the resolution itself after some discussion, in which Rev. F. C. Massingberd, Rev. R. Seymour, Mr. Hubbard, M.P., Archdeacon Churton, and the President took part, and Archdeacon Denison accordingly withdrew his motion. The subject was renewed conversationally at the end of the afternoon session, but the project of embodying the view, however sound, in a more permanent form, was dropped. The same afternoon the Congress resolved itself into a committee to decide on the question of the whereabouts of its meeting for the ensuing year. Several cathedral cities of high antiquity put in their claim, but Manchester, the youngest, was preferred to all, the samples of churchmanship from that seat of labour having apparently strongly impressed the Congress of 1862 with their highly improved quality in a comparatively short space of time. After which, before the meeting dispersed, the Warden of All Souls took that the last opportunity of the presence of the Congress in its integrity—as the evening session was to be sectional—to move a vote of thanks to the President for his 'inimitable conduct in the chair,' which was seconded by the Rev. G. Williams, on behalf of Cambridge and the visitors, and, after being carried in a thunderstorm of applause, was briefly acknowledged by the President.

It will be perceived by looking over this list that more than one-fourth of the papers read or opening speeches made were contributed by laymen, the precise number being six in twenty-three; whilst of the whole number of readers or speakers, being seventy-seven, the laity contributed twenty-two, or nearly one-third. But if on general questions something more than a good sprinkling of the lay element is recognisable, there was one question which the laymen with one accord and with the glad concurrence of the clergy had made their own, viz. Church Finance. On the contrary, in the more distinctly professional

or spiritualistic topics, such as Clerical Education and the work of women in the Church, the laity were contented and interested listeners, but hardly intruded a voice. This is exactly the opposite of what would have happened had a factious spirit ruled. There was no picking holes in others' coats, but a sober statement of each man's thoughts on the subject he had mastered, and of each man's experience on the ground where he felt himself strong. A prudent appreciation of each other was also manifested in this division of labour between the clergy and the laity, and something higher and better than this, brotherly kindness, let us hope, and charity, in the mutual willingness to borrow and to lend in turn whatever strength each most needed and could best supply.

Of the questions discussed, Clerical Education and Church Finance, as bearing directly, the one on the spiritual and intellectual, and the other on the material element in all Church organization whatever, have a cogent and prior claim on the eager attention of all Churchmen. To deal with them in order of discussion, as of real merit, we take first, that of the Education of the Clergy.

The worst difficulty, adduced by Professor Harold Browne, was that of a gradual dearth of men for the clerical office, at least of the intellectual and academic mark to which bishops' chaplains had heretofore been accustomed. If this merely means that other channels are open to enterprise, and that young men of promise are lured away, the matter is one which need surprise no one, nor should it be viewed with un-mixed regret. The gradually increasing burden of poor clergy supplies a balancing fact, when we dwell on the question of secular *versus* ecclesiastical prospects, as drawing men away from or towards the ministry. This, however, is rather external to the real subject, which is, how to give the best clerical education, *given the men*. As a fact, however, which has a strong practical bearing on the quality of education to be given, it merits at least a passing notice. There will be always a precious minority, led by higher spiritual instincts and of a purer leaven than the average, who will seek orders in a simple spirit of self-devotion. But no Church can hope for enough recruits of this stamp to constitute the rank and file of her ministry, and it seems likely that that rank and file must come from a social class to whom the curacy and district church continue to be attractive. The only remedy, then, which the facts suggest, is to improve these prospects, or, in the absence of the requisite ways and means, to accept of the admixture of clergy of a lower social status. In how many directions this impending deterioration of the clerical type opens out paths of

reflection, we should wander far from our subject if we paused to trace. But as regards the question of education, it becomes the more imperative to make the best of the diminished number, if so it be, of higher and more gifted men who are left us, and to economise to the utmost their influence over their fellows. And in the face of the fact above adverted to, and with this object in view, there seems a call for a revival of the theological element in the teaching of the ancient Universities, which Oxford seems to have nearly let go, and Cambridge holds only by the slender thread of the 'voluntary' examination. More than one of the speakers, but most fully Mr. Litton, dwelt on the abandonment of this, once the ruling science or faculty, at Oxford. It was advisedly distinguished from Arts, and made the pinnacle of mental ambition. It has fallen from its pride of place, and is now nowhere. The disputations for its bachelor degree are to a dry humourist the funniest yet dreariest thing in Oxford. The crowd of intelligent foreigners, who have so much refreshed us by their curiosity and improved us by their criticism during this summer, should have been taken by special train straight down to Oxford from the International Exhibition, and should have witnessed in the Divinity School that singular triangular duel in ecclesiastical Latin, presided over by the Regius Professor in the rostrum, which is supposed to test a man's fitness, after passing the paltry ordeal of the B.A. schools, for scaling the loftier heights of theology. How these budding divines can refrain, any more than the Roman augurs, from laughing in the sleeves of their gowns, and why the Regius Professor gives the sanction of his presence to a process so absurd, and yet will not

'—show his teeth by way of smile,'

or give the whole affair its proper explanation, as a joke, has puzzled some and will puzzle more. Mr. Litton points out that theology is the only science excluded from the final schools. Shut out from the only practical *curriculum*, and thus ignored where it might be influential, we might expect that something would have been done to restore it on its own ground. But no, Oxford has retained but a step-mother's affection for this its once most fondly-fostered study, or rather has poured contempt upon it, and is doing what she can to depress and discourage it. The world at large sets a practical value on the test required for a B.A., and Oxford takes the hint and makes the test stringent; but for any test for the B.D. it cares nothing, and Oxford accepts its estimate. We fear that at Cambridge matters are not much better.

Seriously, can nothing be done to wipe off this reproach, and

to show an appreciation of the resources which the Middle Ages, with their rough-hewn strenuousness, applied in their time well, and have bequeathed—no superfluous heritage, if we knew its value—to ours? The decay of theology in its natural and ancient seats has been accompanied by its striking root in other localities, and hence the phenomenon of theological colleges. These modern sources of supply are doubtless doing most useful and laudable work, albeit some of them are a little too plainly the seminaries of a party; but whatever good there is in them might work as from a vantage-ground of eminence, and whatever of obliquity or of further design there is in their view might be counteracted by an association with one of the ancient Universities. Unfortunately these last are in no position to preach to their modern rivals or substitutes. With an ample body of learned teachers and well-endowed chairs, with all store of the material of erudition, with the *prestige* of a name blazoned in history, yet popular in an age of political economy and utilitarianism, with a tradition of schoolmen who strove by ‘searching’ to ‘find out’ truth, of martyrs and confessors who suffered for it, of champions who defended it, and with the pick of the youth of England at their feet as pupils, they have done—what they have done. They stand like ancient fortresses, impregnable in their time, but the flank of which has long been turned, and the heights of which have long been commanded, by the extended range of modern military resources—mere monuments where they should be citadels. Dean Ellicott, in tracing a plan for an association for co-operative union among existing theological institutions, suggested King’s College, London, as a working centre, and the development from thence of a germ of a future theological university, but left Oxford and Cambridge almost out of sight. He spoke of his plan as leaving the old Universities ‘in their proper place,’ which, if it be the place they at present occupy, was a delicately ironical expression. Accurate mental training, and ‘the systematic use of text-books of a logical standard,’ may still be theirs, but the special province of theology is not practically cultivated, save by the ‘voluntary’ examination at Cambridge. Two Cambridge gentlemen, Mr. Beamont of Trinity College, and Mr. Emery of Corpus Christi College, in that University, succeeded in showing that a voluntary and irresponsible, however ‘influential body of divinity professors, parochial clergymen, tutors, and others,’ were giving valuable opportunities for the practical study of pastoral duties, and that at various colleges, especially Trinity, a good deal of private study is made to flow in a theological direction, but they did not attempt to show that the University itself did more than offer an examination, which most of the bishops have agreed to require shall be passed by every candidate for deacon’s

orders.¹ What we miss is the proper action of the University itself in this direction. If more could have been proved, they would at least have attempted the proof. The fact that the course of recent legislation has denuded the ordinary degree of the doctrinal test which previously fenced it, might have been expected to infuse a stronger stimulus into the examination for the academic theological degrees.

Mr. Curteis, of the Lichfield Theological College, wrote as follows in the *Guardian*, of July 16:—‘Speaking for our own College (and I am sure we are very far from standing alone), I may say that, with all possible respect for King’s College, we do not wish to withdraw our allegiance from the old Universities; we do not wish—until their refusal to do justice to theology, and to pay attention to the wishes of the Church, be far more decisively expressed than it is at present—to describe our humble supplementary orbit round any other centre. Yet, if the Universities should be infatuated enough to let slip out of their hands the glorious opportunities they still hold, of weaving the warp and woof of English lay and clerical education, and should permit the number of literate clergy to go on increasing at its present rate, then, no doubt, some organized system of clerical “seminaries” will become indispensable. But God forbid that that fatal system should ever become necessary in England!’

At the same time we must, in justice to the Universities, lay it down, that a system of complete clerical education, including a practical familiarity with pastoral duty, it is not their province to give; nor could such a training be given save at the expense of that more careful culture of theology as a science, which their statutes embody and their traditions avow. For the latter, they have a command of material and machinery which the lapse of generations could hardly accumulate elsewhere. It remains to utilise this, according to a modern standard, and accommodate it to the requirements of living men seeking knowledge in earnest. How this is to be done is a question requiring for its solution a wide review of extra-academic facts, and a careful estimate of a highly complicated position. There are the bishops’ examinations for the diaconate and priesthood; there are modern academic bodies of a general character, like King’s College, London; and the institutions for giving a special theological training, as at Birkenhead, Chichester, and elsewhere, besides the practice alluded to by the President, of ‘a clergyman of a large parish taking four or five young men, and letting them work under his own eye in that parish.’ All

¹ At Oxford, too, a statute was passed in 1842, providing for such an examination, which the bishops have never similarly patronized, and which has, we believe, remained a dead letter.

these agencies, regular or irregular, exist as facts; and much might be said, if need were to say it, in behalf of the practical usefulness, probably of all of them. On the whole, as an initial step, it might do the most good, and exercise the minimum of obtrusive interference, if the Universities were to offer 'local examinations' in theology, as they have of late years done in boys' schools. Many a diocesan college, and probably non-diocesan theological colleges too, might be glad of the bracing influence of the standard which they could supply, and of the guiding hand which they could extend to tentative institutions. As regards the bishops, their archdeacons, and chaplains, being members, as they would almost invariably be, of one of the Universities, might be *ex-officio* members of the local examining body, and have access, to any extent, to the answers of the candidates; whilst on those subjects which outrun the limit of that technical theology which alone the Universities profess, the bishop and his chaplain might conduct the examination for themselves. It does not seem extravagant to suppose that *one* of the episcopal examinations, either that for the diaconate or that for the priesthood, might, with great propriety, and with much advantage both to the bishop and the candidates, be thus conducted by a board of approved academic theologians. Of course it would be reasonable to allow the bishop in all cases a veto upon all admissions to orders on a title in his own diocese; otherwise he would not be able to acquit himself of his responsibility. Some such system as this would probably be attended with a gain in uniformity, and would certainly offer that encouragement to the cultivation of theology proper, which it is confessed on many sides we greatly need. Those who deprecate a theological tripos—a view which enjoys the distinguished authority of the Bishop of Oxford, and for which there is much to be said, though we incline to think that its mischiefs would be outweighed by its benefits—might yet not object to an academical recognition of those who come up to a certain standard of attainment, and whose minds showed, at any rate, the germ of the future theologian. But, at any rate, at the Universities themselves, whatever becomes of the question of these local extensions of their sphere of action, scientific theology might be raised out of the abyss of humiliation in which it now languishes, by the easy co-operation of the colleges. Those in which modern legislation has not wholly swept away the clerical character of the fellows, might require for such fellowships certificates from the University professors in that science as a condition of their tenure. This would go far to furnish such a degree of practical encouragement as would prevent the new development of a genuine theological curriculum from falling dead by its own weight; and a

real examination, instead of the hollow pageant of a mediæval form, might give the B.D., at any rate within the limits of the University, a definite status.

But most of our readers will, we think, share our surprise, when we inform them that, in spite of all that has been said and written of late years on the subject of preaching and reading in church, no stand was made on either of those important and widely interesting topics, in the discussion of the education of the clergy. These are the only two among the future practical duties of a young divine, in which the University might, beyond the strait limits of technical theology, unfold from its ample resources a wide array of useful precept and experience. Of course they may be regarded as details, and so be left out of any discussion which has principles purely for its object; but the great mass of the Church, who only read of this Congress in periodicals, would frame a higher estimate of its practical value, if in a meeting of leading minds among Churchmen, with the professed object of considering clerical education, some special notice had been taken of that on which public attention has been so keenly fixed.

As regards a plan suggested by Dean Ellicott, of cutting down the general academic course, of a little over three years already, to about two, in order to devote the third year to the special study of theology, there or at a college intended for it, we cannot but think that a man's general attainments would suffer by it far more than his theology would be improved. To a man who is not a determined idler, his third year is the golden maturity of what was hitherto a crude season of growth rather than consolidation. To sacrifice it would be to depreciate the results of the whole previous period, and significantly diminish the value of his residence. But, beyond this, how are the years between eighteen and twenty-three to be filled up usefully with a view to the clerical life supposed to be contemplated? Here is the real question. We are not now taking the case of those necessarily *seri studiorum*, whom an ardent wish to serve God in Holy Orders reaches in the various walks of other professions, and who have little enough time in which to conquer the difficulties engendered by long desuetude of regular study, in order to present themselves with a respectable modicum of attainments before the bishop's chaplain, at the earliest possible moment. But for the large number of men whose future profession is an open question when they go up to the University, but who determine for orders in the course of their life there, or who have already decided for the Church's service when they matriculate, it is more wholesome to keep their one object in view from the moment that their choice is fixed, and to avoid

parergic deviations. How, then, are these five years to be best devoted? Surely out of them we can allow the University career its unabated measure. Questions of expense need not embarrass us; for, assuming that a man has resources to meet the ordinary and necessary expenses of an University three-and-a-half years, if there are not yet, among the somewhat numerous theological colleges of which we hear, some where he can live at rather less expense than at home, we may surely say that by this time there ought to be.

Supposing then the academic course allowed its full complement, there remains another year and half to be devoted to special training. Many will think a theological college the best 'finishing academy,' and no doubt to many it furnishes really the best provision which their wants can find. Were the Universities able to meet those wants more effectually, we might urge, that advantages to the thoughtful student would occur there, which he would elsewhere seek in vain. Mr. Beaumont thinks that at Cambridge such advantages already exist (*Proceedings*, p. 30). We sincerely believe that if they so exist they will be turned to account. No one ventured to say as much for Oxford. It was indeed a matter of great regret that so few among the leading academic authorities uttered their voice in the Congress. Cambridge contributed a Divinity Professor and Proctor; and Professor Burrows, besides his zealous labours as Secretary, took a leading part, and performed it well. The Head of All Souls presided in an evening session, and Dr. Pusey, Dr. Acland, and Mr. Woollcombe, Tutor of Balliol, were also more or less conspicuous and effective. But where were the great mass of academic dignitaries, and the working staff of the University? Perhaps at the International Exhibition. Yet a word from one of the divinity professors would have been a word in season. They could have told us the mind of their circle—one of wide observation and experience in reference to this subject, would have been able to point out what may be hoped for from Oxford in theology, and to dispel illusions in which unofficial zeal is apt to indulge. They might also have met with acceptance or with disproof, the remark of the Bishop of Oxford in his able summary of the debate, that the value of their lectures might be raised by granting certificates to the men who proved, that they had been not only bodily in the room during the delivery of the course, but that they had been mentally attentive to it. A grave responsibility seems to rest on the Oxford theological professors. For if the reform which seems to be so much called for be possible, it is surely theirs to initiate it.

On this view the debate on Clerical Education was unsatis-

factory. It was nearly limited to a comparative estimate of the old Universities and newer institutions, and even on this narrow scope of the argument sufficient light was not thrown. As regards, however, the general University course, no curtailment seemed, save by Dean Ellicott, to be proposed. Rather it seemed to be recognised that the utmost breadth of view, and the amplest general development of faculties, is the best acquisition which the mind of the divinity student can derive from an University. We are glad to mark the width and depth of this impression in the minds of the Congress; for assuredly divinity reading, unless seasoned by a rare heavenliness of mind, or counteracted by a strong natural geniality, has a tendency to narrow and dehumanise the mind, and to leave it an easy prey to the extreme fanaticism of dogma. The great numbers of sectarian divines who plunge into commentaries and systems without a first course of ethical and intellectual gymnastics, are ready-made examples of this tendency. And whenever theology shall be made the 'be-all' instead of the 'end-all' of the English clergyman, the broadest, the best, and the most popular feature which separates the Anglican idea, alike social and professional, from that of the Nonconformist will have disappeared. The best general education is the strongest guarantee for the presence of that common sense which solves difficulties, avoids squabbles, mitigates the porcupine irritability of conflicting views, and leavens with something better than abstract truth, the pulpit, the vestry, and the platform. For want of this, orthodoxy has a sting in it, zeal is apt to be overstrained, and all a parish is often sore with the friction of its spiritual machinery.

In the doubt which occurs as to how to spend the interval between the B.A. degree and the deacon's examination, we are inclined to think that many men, after satisfying the demands which any professor's lectures may have upon them, go home and have a little leisure, and that these are not the most imprudent of their class. If a man will set himself to seek it, this is just the time to acquire the habit of meditation, and the circumstances are more favourable to it than any others which can be expected to occur before or after. Of course, if a man is ignorant of what he ought by this time to know, the Bible and the Prayer-book, there is no time to lose. He must read hard still, or postpone his diaconate. But those who are better prepared may endeavour, most wholesomely, to become meditative, as a complement of the clerical character which they can never hope to achieve if they make no progress in it now, when the great step is impending which must leave a permanent mark upon the soul.

Nor is the plan suggested by the President, of a quasi-

apprenticeship to a parish-priest with a large and busy cure, to be overlooked. But we think it may be allowed that a diaconate proper needs no such preliminary stage. It is because priest's work, in all its pastoral branches, is forced on the deacon, that such an introductory stage seems proper; where a diaconate retains its own functions, their exercise is the proper introduction to the higher office. Among other errors, which have flowed from the merging of our diaconate in the priesthood, is this, that a man is expected to change at once and for ever, not by any obvious process, but *per saltum*, from the new-made B.A., and late undergraduate, into the reverend and dignified aspect of spirituality. The assumption being that the deacon is invested in full with the clerical character, all the accessories to that character are looked for at once in him. Hence, an unnatural degree of pressure is put upon the last year before the diaconate is entered upon; and the endeavour is made in a most praiseworthy spirit, but with too little allowance for human nature, to force an external development of clericality, instead of letting it wait upon the internal unfolding of spirituality, and the general maturity of the character. There is something in this treatment in which the extremes of Romanistic and Puritanical coercion of the human spirit meet. The whole mistake lies in making that step bear a consummated and plenary character, which properly has an inceptive and transitional one. It is the diaconate which will discipline for the priesthood those in whom Divine grace fosters the higher and kindlier germs of nature, not the diaconate which needs a distinctive neophytic curriculum in parochial specialities. It is bad to cram for an examination, but it is worse to cram for a character. And the character proper to the priest is, of all others, the one most certain to suffer from such a strain.

This leads us easily on to the papers in which the group of subjects connected with 'the extension of the ministry' was discussed, including not only the 'enlargement' of the agencies which exist, but the 'supplementing' them by others with which Church history and modern experience are familiar. The series opened by a speech from Mr. Beresford Hope, on the 'Increase of the Episcopate,' which he regarded from the diocesan point of view rather than from the functional. There is this in favour of the ground he took, that, in this way, each addition to the Episcopal body will be made at the demand of those who are most interested in asking for it. It is better it should proceed from the voices below than from those above. Above all, it is best it should proceed from the laity. It can only be expected to prevail when it expresses their sentiments, and can hardly fail whenever they are willing to tax themselves to contribute

the necessary endowment. Lay voices have always this in their favour, that they are the only voices heard in the House of Commons—the ordeal of every Church measure requiring the sanction of the Government. It would be difficult to resist permanently the complaint of a diocese—laity as well as clergy—that they needed another bishop, backed by the statement that they were willing to provide for him. Certain questions as to his position in reference to other existing bishops, such as whether he should be a *chorepiscopus*, *i.e.* subordinate to the already existing spiritual chief of the diocese, or have an independent see, would need to be settled, especially if any such general movement on the part of dioceses were to take place. The graver question as to whether his nomination was to be purely by the Crown, would also need attention. This was the view of the subject which was chiefly taken up in debate, the Hon. Colin Lindsay being disinclined to enlarge the prime minister's patronage, while Archdeacon Churton thought that, when duly exercised and restrained by public opinion, the best authority for the appointment of bishops was that of the responsible advisers of the Crown. At any rate, that demand for the increase of the episcopate is likely to be most influential which goes farthest to rebuke the coarse Erastian view of the demagogue, that bishops, save so far as they tend to check clerical extravagances and to keep the clergy well down under the temporal thumb, are mere gilded superfluities, of which the fewer the better.

Professor Harold Browne's paper upon the 'Extension of the Ministry,' meaning the lower orders of clergy, dwelt chiefly on the important points that the Church of England has a mere nominal diaconate, and that she has not succeeded in recruiting her ministry from the great social middle class. He pointed out some of the evils which had sprung up in the double gap thus caused. We want more men, actually as hands at the work; but, according to the present resources and current estimate of the ministerial office, we cannot hope to offer reasonable remuneration and prospects. The clergy were distracted amid the multiplicity of work; the remedy for which lay not in the subdivision of large parishes into districts spiritually independent, but a fuller organization, in which, under a single able parochial chief, all the necessary aids might be rallied round the parish church. The committing of details to other hands would leave more leisure for theological pursuits. The introducing a lower social leaven into the clerical body the Professor deprecated; whereas the plan which he advocated would, he alleged, tend to raise the clerical standard. They would thus not sink into a depressed state of weariness and exhaustion, with large fields of duty still beyond their grasp. We should have fewer specimens

of the clerical hack, and a more complete occupancy of the whole area of parochial labour. In short, the Church would thus be manned up to a full complement. The absence of true deacons, and the exclusion—not intended, but actual—of the middle class from the ministry, might be to some extent remedied together. The recovery of the latter to its affection for the Church, and to its proper position among her ministerial resources, might be accomplished—the one by the means of the other. The diaconate would extend the influence of the priesthood, and the value of such officers among the lower population in pioneering the way for the higher ministration, would be probably considerable.

The practical cessation of the diaconate in our Church, and the chasm thereby left open in her resources, had before been pointed out. Twelve years ago, in a pamphlet, and again, ten years ago, in a Charge, the Archdeacon of London called attention to the facts to which subsequent experience has added little, save in so far as longer experience gives more emphatic testimony to what was already plain. We quote from the former of these publications, entitled '*The Duties of the Deacons and Priests in the Church of England compared, with Suggestions for the Extension of the Order of Deacons, and the Establishment of an Order of Sub-deacons,*' London, Rivingtons, 1850. There the Archdeacon says:—

'I think it can hardly be denied that, though every man who is admitted to the ministry in our Church, is first ordained a deacon, there will be found scarcely a single instance in which the deacon confines himself to the specific duties of his office. If the Church, in her Ordinal, has prescribed the sphere of duty, the boundaries of that sphere are openly transgressed. Instead of considering himself intrusted with no other duty than that of publicly ministering in the congregation, the deacon acts as one who has the cure of souls, and regards himself as a watchman, messenger, and steward of the Lord; the permission to preach the Gospel publicly in the Church, is to him licence to "teach and to premonish" in the cottage and in the family; and when he hears at the ordination to the priesthood how serious a charge is about to be committed to him, he is conscious that there is not one of the duties mentioned in the exhortation describing the awfulness of priesthood, which, as a zealous and active curate, he has not laboured to perform; and he is perhaps rather surprised that, whilst the duties which he has already performed without authority are proposed to him so earnestly as new duties, the other points of duty, which he knows that he has not before received authority to perform, and which are commonly accounted the only characteristics of priesthood, are not at all pressed upon his consideration at this most awful period of his life.'

This writer goes on to point out the practice of our bishops, in which he thinks that a change 'has perhaps lately taken place,' according to which practice admission to the diaconate would be refused to a candidate who wished to remain in the exercise of that office without seeking the priesthood. He even thinks

that 'the very expression of such a wish on the part of a deacon 'would have been considered to indicate a mind so unprepared to 'devote itself to God, and so engrossed in the pleasures of the 'world, as wholly to disqualify him for admission even to the 'lowest step of the Christian ministry.' That such was the rule in the diocese of London, only two years before the Archdeacon thus wrote, is a fact to which many clergy can testify. The then bishop refused to allow a deacon who was disinclined to become a priest within a year, to continue in his cure, or in the diocese, and even threatened to do what he could to prevent his ordination as priest at any future time in another diocese. The Archdeacon supposes, with some probability, that at no time since the Reformation has a diaconate pure and simple been 'to any considerable extent exemplified in our Church.' The want has, by the slow transit of social changes, become more glaring than at first. On the clergy is conventionally laid the blame of the heathenized myriads multiplying from below in the body social, but the clergy's efforts are not only overpowered by numbers, but they are eluded by remoteness and want of contact. 'Every additional presbyter who is located in any new district, 'whether as incumbent or curate, finds the want of some persons to help him in his duties; the interval between himself 'and the lowest of his people is one which, however he amplifies 'his labours, he cannot fill.' To this he ascribes 'the rise of an 'order of men heretofore unknown in our communion, under the 'title of Scripture readers;' and adds, 'Upon this one fact alone 'I would rest my proof that the time is now come for the 'enlargement of the order of deacons, or at least for the formal 'restoration of some of the lower orders of the ministry, the 'sub-diaconate and readership.' It is difficult for the most prejudiced opponent to find fault with the proof, or to justify the statement of facts proved. Here is a diaconate which is above doing deacon's work, here is a superabundance of deacon's work needing to be done, and here are a new set of men intruded into the function, who have neither the guarantees of official relation to the Church, nor the safeguards, so far as they go, of education and social position—an 'underground railway,' as it were, to relieve the traffic on the surface.

Whether a revived diaconate would draw to any considerable extent upon the middle classes is, however, doubtful. If a new order were invented, or an old one revived especially for them, and with the notion that it was to be *the* middle class order, we cannot suppose that such an advertisement would tempt them to enlist in it. But a diaconate might be expected to draw certainly at first, and probably at all times upon that class chiefly who had more leisure, rather than upon those who are absorbed

in business. Many who combine with the necessary leisure, a self-distrustful humility, which prevents their seeking orders, and an earnestness of character tinged with devotion, might be expected to join such a diaconate. In reckoning who they are who might offer for it, we ought to consider the terms of office; and among them this, that certainly there is no precedent in our Church, nor perhaps in any other, for the deacon combining with his sacred functions, any of those occupations in which our middle class more commonly engage. It is distinctly stated by Bingham (*Book III. chap. i. 5*), that even the lower orders of sub-deacon, acolyte, reader, and the like, were always esteemed to bind for life, unless the receiver were exalted to a higher order. It does not follow that the same standard of clericality need be adopted for a deacon as for a priest, nor for a sub-deacon as for a deacon. Occupations, accordingly, which are unclerical for the priest need not always be so for the deacon; and so of the latter as compared with the sub-deacon or reader. None of them should engage in any pursuit which is inconsistent with his calling; but the same thing may be inconsistent with the higher and consistent with the lower. Again, as regards stipend, that assignable to a deacon could not perhaps, as clerical incomes rule, ordinarily be higher than that of Scripture Readers now, which is about 70*l.* a year. There might not be the same, nor any objection, to their wives engaging in some business suitable to women. But under the most advantageous circumstances, there would be no sufficient inducement as regards emolument, to lead minds familiar with the snug affluence of a well-to-do retailer to engage in the diaconate, even though they cared less for worldly prospects than do the generality of the clergy. We are not, of course, speaking of the rarer spirits, who may feel themselves called, like him of old, from 'the receipt of custom' to a ministry of the Word; but of the incomparably larger class, capable of self-denial within certain limits, yet more impressed with the text which tells them that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire.' On the whole, shopkeepers would not view such a diaconate as an eligible investment for a son. The dissenting deacon keeps his shop, and it, not his diaconate, keeps him. Here is the difference.

There is another class of men besides the Scripture Readers, to whom the diaconate might be a great safeguard—we mean schoolmasters. And the greater the number of them who could be made available at once in the school, and to some extent in the parish, the greater security would there be for the orthodoxy of the school, and for the erudition of the deacon.

A difficulty was suggested by a speaker in this debate, what test to adopt, in distinguishing between permanent deacons and

those who were probationers for the priesthood. This does not seem really formidable. We presume there will always be a limited number, known to the bishops, of titles for the priesthood in every diocese. This, if that number were, say, only one in five to the number of deacons, would tend to check the aspirations of the candidates; especially if, as might be the case, an University course, or some supposed equivalent training, were required in all cases for priests' orders. But the surest remedy lies in the bishop's own hands, viz. his examination; which he may always make more or less severe according as he finds it necessary to check or promote an influx. The paper of English to be turned into Latin prose, would prove an effectual stop-cock to shut off the advance of ineligible specimens of the diaconate; supposing the extension of that order to draw recruits from the classes of whom we have been speaking.

Now, certainly, he was a bold experimentalist who first set up the Scripture Readers' organization. There is attending it the sole benefit that a larger proportion of the laity receives domiciliary visitation, and this is likely to draw no inconsiderable consequences in its train. But the character of these consequences depends mainly on that of the superintendence of the parish priest himself. If his guidance be judicious, and his control ample, the machinery works towards the same end as that of a diaconate might, or that of a sisterhood, though with considerably less efficiency. But the letting loose a rambler in theological talk to acquire the ear of the poor, and hold from house to house colloquial homilies unchecked, is likely to end in cooling their hearts towards the duly authorised teaching of the Church. It is nearly, but not quite so bad, in most cases, to set a middle-aged Scripture Reader to work under a curate fifteen or twenty years younger than himself. The elder man has an acquired fluency and a natural familiarity of style, which throws the younger man into the shade, and the population learn to 'despise his youth,' and set up the Reader as his rival. Hence follows sometimes the crowning evil spoken of by Canon Woodgate, of the Reader turning against his clergyman; short of which extreme case, however, there are many stages of contrast between the well-subordinated efficiency of an extended diaconate, and the uncertain and sporadic action of the present organization of Readers, which no one can doubt would be in favour of the former. All that has been proved in positive favour of the latter is that they are mostly better than nothing—a little or a good deal better as the case may be. And he who should, after allowing the experiment of the Reader, hesitate to risk the resumption of the diaconate proper, would truly be straining at the gnat after having swallowed the camel.

The more immediate dependence of the pure and simple deacon on the bishop, ought not to be omitted from our view of the wholesome checks on that ministry. There would be, of course, a double dependence in the case of every deacon admitted to share parochial work, inasmuch as he would be responsible to the parish priest for the fulfilment of his special work, in addition to that original dependence simply on the bishop. Hence arose the appellations applied to the deacons, as noted by Bingham (Book II. chap. xx. 18), of the bishop's eyes and ears, right-hand, &c.; and hence, too, a bishop, if absent from a council, was represented, not by presbyters, but by deacons (*Ibid.* 13). This dependence of the deacon on the bishop would indirectly give the latter a control, often desirable, over some points of parochial organization, which now are solely regulated by the parish priest, often defective in the wider experience and extended general views, which his bishop may be supposed to enjoy. As we stand at present, each parish is too much isolated, and each incumbent has too largely the power of doing just what and how he pleases, 'each man that which is right in his own eyes.' A system of parochial reports might be required and received by the bishop from the deacon, and a complete *speculum gregis* more easily be digested by the bishop for his own use. Further, it is plain, how large a measure of relief from overpowering duties might be derived by the parish priest from a sufficient number of deacons, the more able among whom might, with episcopal sanction, temporarily supply the absence of the parish priest in all duties, in which his special power was not required. They might read his sermons (Bingham, *ibid.* 11), which he might be too infirm, from temporary illness, to deliver, and procure for him that respite from duty which would often save him from prematurely breaking down. Such an extended organization might create a pressing demand for the increase of the episcopate, but this would hardly be deemed a reason against it.

As regards the 'minor orders,' to which Mr. Massingberd's paper was devoted, it seems plain that they should in due course follow an extended diaconate, not precede it. To do otherwise would be to rig a ship with topgallant masts and royal-poles, before her topmasts were inserted. The 'minor orders' were, in fact, historically developed from the diaconate, the deacons being originally 'employed to perform all such offices as were in after ages committed to those orders.' (*Ibid.* 15.) Doubtless, a ministry perfectly developed in proportion to our present needs might easily find room for several of them. The humble but time-honoured offices of parish clerk, beadle, sexton, and the like, would be strengthened in their attachment to the Church, and in that *esprit de corps* without which numbers are

as often a source of weakness as of strength, if they had some other tie to their duties besides their salaries. The slovenliness, venality, and rapacity, which sometimes draw contempt upon them, would tend to be mitigated by developing in their eyes a spiritual aspect of their office, while the whole body of ecclesiastical officials would be 'strengthened by that which every—even the humblest—'joint supplieth.' Nor do we see anything but an increased efficiency, arising from a higher conscientiousness likely to be unfolded, in the same spiritual tie including such persons, though not filling strictly ecclesiastical functions, as are now employed as masters of workhouses, and assistants in hospitals, and even in prisons. Wherever a number of individuals are placed under the care and guardianship, and therefore, to a considerable extent, in the power of another, it must be some guarantee for the discharge of those duties in the spirit of Christian charity, that such guardian should bear about him the stamp of a character not of this world, and be entitled freely to give information to, and receive advice from, those to whom the pastoral care properly belongs. In these ways the Church might extend her influence into many areas of charitable work, which the parochial organization does not take in, or with which purely spiritual functions have scarce a point of contact. The requisite checks and cautions which such an extension of machinery would require, could not be devised *à priori*, but the survey of experience would soon easily map them all; and a tentative period might soon prepare a generation ripe for larger action on a system definite and tangible. The example of the Wesleyans is pointed at by Mr. Massingberd, and there, at any rate, ample experience is to be found by any who will gather it. The Church with her vast social resources might easily extract from any rival system whatever good it contains, refine and clarify it from the dregs it might involve, and utilize the result according to the wisdom from Above, which her Head is ever ready to impart to those seeking the health of His body.

We cannot but think that to extract from the social system, all the raw material of spiritual power which lurks within it, is the prerogative and the duty of the Church; and there is nothing in her experience to justify half-hearted doubts as to the sufficiency of its amount for all her needs. There is a fascination in self-devotion which wins many, and finds out the way to hearts which make no response, till thrown upon their own enthusiasm by the promptings of a voice entitled to make the appeal. Let her draw out—for she has the true talisman—the devotion of her sons, and she will find the filial feeling multiply and grow more intense the more she probes for it. She holds the divining rod by which these hidden treasures are

brought to light, the *aurum irreperitum* of spirits waiting to exclaim, 'Here am I; send me.' At any rate, a truly catholic system, in all its width of sympathy and depth of stirring power, should first be exercised; and when we have touched the limits of these resources—if indeed those limits be not found to be rather a horizon which recedes as we advance—it will be time enough to supplement the agency of orders, greater and less, with the more hybrid agency of semi-laic substitutes. Let the lower courses of her walls not be laid in such half-baked bricks as these.

Church finance was a layman's question, and dealt with as such; that is to say, the laity felt there the ground strongest under their feet, and many of the more leading clergy had only particular, not general experience. And whereas the number of clergy was to that of laity attending Congress, as near as those can guess who were in the best position for judging, about four to one, the *lay* speakers on this question were to the *clerical* as *two to one* nearly. The Church appears to have discovered in the offertory the philosopher's stone. It carries in itself the means of remedying discontent; and few prejudices have been found so inveterate as not to give way to it. If there are a few strong recalcitrants, they may often be won over as auditors, or propitiated by being requested to name cases for relief by the alms so gathered, or at any rate left uninfluential by the obvious usefulness of it as the parochial funds increase. We believe there never yet existed a parish in which such an increase would not be found, after a fair trial to have taken place; and this alone, whenever the fact is recognised, answers a world of objections. The most dogged opponent is convinced by a good balance-sheet, and a larger balance in hand, by there being plenty given and plenty spent, and yet no vacuum or deficit. A Mr. Pierrepont, of Warrington, stood up in Congress, and confessed his errors on this point; he had lived to see he was wrong in opposing the offertory, and in the end such men—for this is the power of truth—become often the largest givers, as though in voluntary penance for their errors, and to redeem the time of their prejudiced opposition. They wake up to the principle of giving, as a privilege, to God through His poor, in His Church, and the principle is mighty. They have long given niggardly, as to a human mendicant; or churlishly, as to be rid of importunity; or pompously, as to their own love of fame; or with prudent coldness, as if making an investment and looking for a return: they now give with shame and self-abasement, yet with the large-handedness of love. The feeling is very catching when once awakened, and to extract the pence of those least able to give, small as the yield of such withered ears may be, yet often provokes to Christian emulation of good works the man

whose heart has choked with wealth. On this account, as well as for the higher motive, than none who are in case to earn it should forfeit the blessing of the mite; the bag or plate should never miss the poor. Without indulging any romantic visions of a golden age of charity, it may be said that the business-like routine of an offertory, conducted with due vigilance as to auditing and expenditure, is the surest key to a wide range of hearts. Its charm lies in its perfect freedom and entire faithfulness. It appeals to the individual conscience to tax itself, and never challenges its estimate, or reflects on the possible contrast between the resources and the contribution; and many who had apparently frozen up against the clamour of unsifted appeals, see in the parish church and its local appendages of education and relief, at once the constant monitor and the abiding monument of a faith which works by love. Thus men, who had hardened in the habit of withholding, find a point within themselves at which the tide silently turns, and subsequently harden in the opposite habit of giving. We do not quite see, with Mr. Claughton, why 'other means must be given up, and this alone depended upon to raise a fund for Church purposes;' yet we would allow, that the more the casual and stray subscriptions can be absorbed and methodized in this one channel, the better. The parish priest thereby knows better what he may reckon upon, and the parishioners what is expected from them. Dr. Hume, of Liverpool, quoted some telling statistics as to the small number of persons who give, and the small number of objects given to, under a system of manifold subscription lists for special institutions. The volley of missives of appeal fly over the heads of the great mass of people. The collector beats the highways and hedges for a very wild-foot game, while the parish priest gathers to the fold a domesticated breed, and fills the milk-pail with a constant yield. Then there is the collector's percentage to come from the total collected, whereas the offertory presents its sum untouched. As regards endowments, rates, Easter offerings, or other dues to which custom gives a sanction often little inferior to law, the offertory, where they exist, is a valuable supplement to them all: where they are wanting, it is the only effectual substitute.

We especially commend, in reference to this subject, the paper read by Mr. Hubbard, whose own munificence adds weight to his words, and takes from them any possible sting. Never was a lay sermon better delivered, or better received. He spoke not only to Churchmen at large, on a topic of common interest, but to the clergy, on a question which touched them home, and where such advice from such a man, if it came not before it was needed, yet exactly fitted both his position and

that of his clerical listeners. We will give his words. After telling a characteristic anecdote of a clergyman, whose charge included some of the most opulent districts of the City, and who, when urged to request his flock to contribute to a work of unquestionable merit, replied that he was on the most cordial terms with his parishioners, but that if he was once to ask them for money, it would create between them and him 'an irreparable breach,' he thus touched on the opposite fault more common at the present day, that of launching headlong into expenditure without any clear view of responsibilities incurred, or resources to meet them :—

'Precautions against pecuniary irregularity are the more indispensable, because the clergy, who, from the nature of the work, are interested in its direction, inevitably suffer either in purse or in reputation from any misappropriation of funds which they assist in administering. The prosperity of Church work must always be intimately connected with the estimation in which the clergy are held for personal integrity as well as for zeal and learning, and nothing more surely impairs that estimation than a notoriety of being implicated in pecuniary irregularities. Cases of this kind have been too frequent, and the Church has seriously suffered from the scandals which have ensued. It is true that with rare exceptions these scandals originated in schemes of which the professed objects were irreproachable, and which might have worked much good had they been commenced with a reasonable expectation of means to complete them. But enthusiasts are so impatient to behold the fruition of their schemes—to reap a harvest for which they have not sown—that they rush into engagements without securing the power of fulfilling them; and failure and disgrace are the natural conclusion of what they presumptuously call "working in faith." Their own ruin is not unfrequently postponed by involving their friends in the same predicament as themselves, for it is a lamentably common practice among the clergy when embarrassed to procure temporary relief by borrowing from institutions which lend a given sum on the bond of the borrower and of two sureties, with the additional security of a life policy for twice the amount of the loan. This system of borrowing, which adds to the burden of the interest the additional burden of the premium on the life assurance, renders the ruin deferred for a time only more inevitable through the costliness of the relief. Many are the clergy who have suffered in the character of guarantor for their compliance with the entreaties of a friend who begged them, as a mere form, to add their name to a bond which, he assured them, entailed no real responsibility, and of which they would never hear again; but who have been summoned, when they least expected it, to redeem their suretyship at serious inconvenience to themselves and detriment to their families. As a general rule the clergy should avoid making documentary engagements for money, either in their own behalf or on behalf of others, and they should make it a positive rule never to become guarantors for a sum which they could not give without inconvenience. While I deprecate, however, the presumption of men who designate their rash and ill-considered undertakings "works of faith," I am far from undervaluing the efficacy of faith as the moving and sustaining power in all good works. True faith may lead a man, for the sake of Christ, to venture even all he has, but it will never lead him to risk the property of others, and I regard it as a desecration of faith and charity to plead faith as the excuse for improvident expenditure, and to appeal in the name of charity for help when its refusal must entail a scandal on the Church and disgrace on its ministers.'

Such was the principal part of Mr. Hubbard's peroration. Perhaps on some of his hearers the cap which he shaped might have fitted more closely than pleasantly. Our readers have no doubt painful recollections of financial scrapes, into which persons, worthy of all reverence on every other ground, have fallen within these last few years by pursuing a course of 'simple faith,' unchecked by sordid calculations, but which in its results hardly differs from that better known in commercial circles by divers names varying in severity from 'speculation' up to 'swindling.'

Mr. Hubbard had before pointed out the solidity of the financial resources of the Church, with three-fourths of the population and wealth of England and Wales at her back. He supposes, and his calculation seems reasonable, that tenfold the sum now devoted to works of piety and charity might be easily spared from the savings of this number, or contributed from what they spend in luxury. He turns for a moment to point a scornful finger at the sorry substitutes in common vogue for the comprehensive appeal on the ground of duty owed to God and man. 'Dinners,' he says, 'are the established medium of support for English charities, but balls and concerts are not neglected, and bazaars, if only occasional, are not unimportant means of providing funds for philanthropic objects.' It has no doubt been held by moral anatomists that the way to a man's heart was through his œsophagus, but we hope that the reign of the toast-master shows some signs of giving way. The eloquence of that racy hireling, with the response of the popping cork, and the dauby eulogiums, from the chair, of distinguished individuals, whose balance is known to be as heavy as the viands discussed, and whose credit as sound as their digestive organs, have not yet become a legend of the past. Will the revels of the rich ever cease to be solemnized as a means of the relief of the poor? Shall it still be said of Charity in modern, as of Venus in ancient times, *sine Cerere et Baccho friget*? Simpler and more earnest ages associated charity with self-denial, which we have learned to couple with self-indulgence. Enough of these gorged and bloated 'love-feasts.' Surely the relief of affliction is ill prefaced by the iced punch and turtle, the Royal Highnesses and Right Honourables, the pomp and parade, ecclesiastical and civil, naval and military, the stars and garters, the toasts and songs, the twaddle and adulation, the drivelling and bombast, which we have been hardened by usage to accept and to recognise.

If internal evidence be wanted in the debates of this Congress to show its practical usefulness, we commend the inquirer to this upon Church Finance. Two gentlemen equally well

known wherever money is made and wherever it is given away, Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Cotton, gave their advice on the questions how to get money for Church purposes, and how to avoid monetary difficulties. The clergy sat contentedly at the feet of these lay teachers, and, let us hope, were edified in conscience and fortified in prudence. The day seems to have passed in which a layman might revise proof-sheets of lectures for a future bishop on points of faith and doctrine, as Joshua Watson did for Van Mildert; but every layman can make the province of finance his own by simple watchfulness, faithfulness, and experience; and to prevent waste is hardly second to promoting liberality.

We wish we had more space available to give a suitable notice to Mr. Meyrick's paper on the Church of England abroad and her relations to the Churches of the Continent. The gravity of the political occasion which seems imminent adds weight to his words. It seems a more and more hopeful problem every six months that a great shock may be given to the Papal power in its Italian home. Not that the temporal dominion, if destroyed, need greatly affect the spiritual ascendancy of the Pope. The sands of the Tiber will run with gold, but up it instead of down, up at least as far as the Vatican, whenever the temporal supremacy of the Pope is merged in Italian freedom. Still, though the offerings of the faithful may more than compensate territorial loss, they cannot check the impulse likely to be given to the Italian mind by union and liberty. No reform in religion can be accepted by a nation from without. It must spring up in its own bosom. The nibbling spirit of proselytism frets about the edges, but is really incommensurate with the work. Exeter Hall has no sufficient sympathy with the myriads whom it regards as in Papal darkness. It may pick up a stray sheep here and there, but on the fold it will never make impression. It uses too plainly the language of abhorrence to win. The best thing to be done meanwhile is, doubtless, to keep before the eye of Christendom—Papal, Greek, or Nestorian—the image of a Church which under Providence succeeded in reforming itself, yet without severing its continuity of catholicism or mutilating the fulness of its type. It is sure to influence some amid the general upheaving of mind which we may expect; and there are even now names in Italian story which would recover brightness at the era of a national Reformation, and corners of Italy sacred to the noble but unavailing efforts which the sixteenth century witnessed. As to the question, or rather taunt, that the apostolic model of our Church makes no impression, that corrupt communions hug their abuses and shut their eyes, and what next is to be done? we need not be careful

to answer them in this matter:’ where our power of lawful action ends, there ends our responsibility. Let such as dare, trouble those which some are presumptuously pleased to call ‘dead Churches,’ with their intrusive help and usurping zeal. It is enough for us to let our light shine before men, without officiously proclaiming either the mote or the beam in our brother’s eye, and contrasting with Pharisaic unction his danger of perdition in his errors with our own largeness of gospel light. This mild and brotherly witness is what the Anglo-Continental Society has been the chief agent in maintaining. Its difficult and self-restrictive task finds few supporters, because fiery zealots spurn measured and precautionary means, in order to rush headlong on their end in view by whatever seems the most propulsive agency. They must needs assume the task of setting their brother’s house in order, instead of being content to send abroad the knowledge which might possibly, by God’s blessing and in His own time, be the seed of a reformation from within.

We wish, in the debate on the influence of the Church in the House of Commons, which followed the same evening in the same section, some one had touched on the effect of clerical ‘jobs’ in the matter of preferment as affecting that influence. They beget a restless itching of the fingers of certain honourable members to grip and clutch, or at any rate to give a rude wrench and staggering shock to the endowments which produce such examples of cupidity. The Durham Cheese affair is the sort of thing to shake Church influence in the House. The engrossment of good things in the temporal sense begets no *odium theologicum*, but a cold-blooded contempt, in such an assembly of sharp-witted laymen. They are sure of their seats ordinarily only for a five or six years’ tenure; whereas the clergy wish to be their clients for protection in the enjoyment of their incumbencies for life. Hence these keen laymen are wonderfully acute at a flaw and sensitive at a scandal. ‘The great majority of members are disposed to take the course that gives them least trouble,’ but an adverse vote on a *prima facie* Cheese case is always more easy than a consideration of the merits. For the rest, it seems difficult to push the principle of the matter further than the point where Mr. Napier left it, and on which the Bishop echoed him, that ‘the Church’s power in the House will depend on her work out of it.’ That the battle of the Church on those benches must be fought at the hustings and at the registration courts is not the obvious sense of these words, but is an important corollary to them. The reader of the paper and the president both meant that active usefulness in spiritual works was the best guarantee for temporal influence;

and if that temporal influence is to grow in the House, its seed-plot must be the constituency. The Church has her constituency everywhere, embracing all those fragments which tessellate the map; a raised tone in her ministers will permeate the whole. Let her influence men in their families, and she will carry their votes. Her lay members should raise their enthusiasm to the point at which men cross-question candidates for the suffrage. The question might be, 'Will you uphold, or vex the Church?' Let it once be seen that men at the hustings care for the temporal adjuncts of spiritual things as upheld by law, and the greatest possible change will be wrought in the attitude of legislators. That there may be a sufficiently massive column of laymen willing thus to put their shoulders to the wheel, on behalf of Church interests, the only method is to imbue with a deeper veneration for her a wider circle of minds. This is being done, and we see the beginning of its fruits; may it be so stedfastly done that no generation may see the end of them!

The discussion on the work of women in the Church, more than any other topic, makes us regret the inefficient representation of that party who have traditionally a suspicion of everything above the 'district visitor' organization. On one ground alone is their uneasy feeling as regards women's work, organized and consecrated, to be explained—that every recruit enlisted must needs strengthen the love of order, knit more closely the bands of Church membership, and strengthen the stays of Church authority. Strictness of devotion has always a strong sympathy for obedience, because it tends to weaken self-will. Those therefore who look chiefly or solely to individualism will naturally distrust that which tends to strengthen co-operative action and the orderly movement of many wills under a law. But apart from this, the enormous gain to the spiritual efficiency of parish or diocese, which subsidizes and organizes female co-operation, is apparent on the most careless inspection of things around us. The fact of a large disproportion of women to men on the tables of the Census seems to throw in our way, as if providentially, the very material of that agency in a quantity which no other Church probably has at her disposal. Amongst this large surplus there doubtless is a considerable fraction who would be fitter for lives of devotion, than are many of those who in the Romish Church are spirited into perpetual vows in a moment of enthusiasm or depression. The calling, and the sanctions which exist for it, are largely misunderstood, or rather ignored; and it is unfortunate that our Authorized Version has here imported into S. Paul's words a preciseness of meaning which they cannot claim in the Greek, if we should

not rather say that it has given an erroneous phrase in rendering a most important dictum. It seems that the word rendered 'their wives,' in 1 Tim. iii. 11, cannot have that meaning; and when we consider the array of rules about official personages or orders amidst which it stands, and, still more, when we compare Rom. xvi. 1, where the word elsewhere rendered 'deacon,' or 'minister,' is found applied to a woman, there seems no doubt that 'women' are meant, living under some Church rules of order, and officially set apart for duties, very probably those specified in verse 10, as constituting a claim for admission to the rank of 'widows.' These interpretations are so familiar to many of our readers, as to seem perhaps mere impertinences here; but there are so large a number who, though they acknowledge theoretically, require to be practically reminded that the Authorized Version is not the ultimate standard of appeal, that it is worth while to bring out fully the point that the Church in S. Paul's day had 'women' who, under his authority, so devoted themselves to the work of the Church, that he thought them not unworthy to be rated with its priests and deacons, and for whose official character he gave rules. Women specially thus serving God form no mediæval figment, but the practice is one of the primitive period, and purely scriptural in the authority on which it rests. As 'the women' bear a prominent part, or rather *the* prominent part, in the personal ministry to the Saviour while on earth, it is natural to look for their expansive energies and vivid sympathies being cast into the moral treasury of His Church among its earliest offerings. That, as a resource, female ministry was abundant we have cumulative proofs; that it should have been duly economized, regulated, and organized, would be most highly agreeable to nature and reason, even were there not the undeniable proof of chapter and verse, which there is. It is one of the few elementary points, indeed, regarding the organic structure of the primitive Apostolic Church which we may regard as admitting of no doubt.

And though changes in climate, in period, and in social constitution, may be allowed to cause great corresponding changes in the working system of a Church, so that things wholesome in the apostles' time, nay, among the first requisites, may become prejudicial subsequently; yet, if we compare our social system with theirs, there is evidently now rather less reason than more why the use of women in holy works should be lost to the Church. First, there is the high domestication which marks English life, and leaves the proper field for female influence always open. This of itself gives a *prestige* to ministering womanhood which no country upon earth can probably share with us. There is, next, the increased strain upon male energies

by increased competition, the extent to which the faculties of men are drugged with business, and their feelings steeped in the torpor of its fumes; and there is, lastly, not only a slight surplusage, it is believed, of female population in the world at any given moment, but there is the great preponderance, which has increased and is increasing, of female life over male in these islands—a 'balance in hand,' out of which society may afford to pay an unusually large bonus to the Church. The higher complexity of social ranks in this country than in most others, if it makes the problem, while novel, somewhat difficult, is likely to make subordination more facile when a scheme has been worked out. A national Church should reflect, by its organization, the society in whose bosom it works, and improve its very disparities, of which there cannot possibly be one scale for all nations, to a spiritual account. But beyond, and including all these reasons, is the life breathed into womanhood by Christianity, constituting of woman, as it were, a new spiritual entity, which never can expire save with Christianity itself, and which our Church, considering her return to primitive purity at the Reformation, ought to display in greater abundance.

Dr. Howson, in his able discussion of the question of 'deaconesses,' after deprecating certain prejudices, and laying down an outline of a parochial and diocesan plan for their action, enters thus into the pith of his subject:—

'I should like to see Deaconess' training institutions occupy something like the place of our training colleges for schoolmasters and mistresses—*i.e.* on the whole diocesan, but not stiffly diocesan. The regularly appointed deaconesses would then be like the certificated teacher, and we might say that the probationer (for I should lay very great stress on a period of probation) would be in some such position as pupil teachers working locally under the diocesan training institution. This central place of training would be the point of connexion with the other organizations of the diocese. But it would need much more than this in reference to the diffused work of deaconesses. Here would be the hospital, which would give that medical training which I regard as desirable in greater or less measure for all these female ministers. Here would be provision for that devotional training which would bear fruit afterwards in scenes of detached or difficult work. Here would be a bond of union, eminently helpful to those who, separated from each other, are struggling with difficulties. Here would be a home for the deaconesses in time of sickness or old age. Here would be that store of experience which grows up in the midst of associated work, where in individual cases what is painfully learnt is often suddenly lost. Here, too, is provision for what may be called the diaconic succession; whereas what is established by individuals, or by parties without any connexion with an existing institution, is very apt to die or fall into abuse.'

Descending to details, he lays it down that the 'dress' worn should be 'distinctive though not peculiar,' a limitation which, we confess, somewhat puzzles us. Is a Christ's Hospital boy's costume distinctive, or peculiar? is a charity-girl's peculiar, or

distinctive? He recognises not only 'food and raiment, shelter and sympathy, and a home for life,' as the due of her who devotes her life's services, but also 'payment,' in the harder sense of the term, as falling within his ideal. He solves the question of rank in life by seeking to comprehend 'all classes,' and, for reasons above hinted, we incline to agree with him. He thinks the 'mode of appointment should be a distinctly religious act;' but thinks the 'special mode' unimportant, if only it be done openly and in some recognised manner.

Here a subsequent speaker, Mr. Scudamore, takes him up, insisting that the laying on of hands alone can fulfil the precedent of the ancient Church, or justify the use, save allusively, of the title 'deaconess;' and that, without such ordination, we should have the name without the thing. He refers to the nineteenth canon of the Council of Nicæa, from the language of which it appears impossible to doubt that the then deaconesses had been so ordained,¹ and were reckoned, as we see they were, by S. Paul, in 1 Tim. iii. 11, among the clergy. The language of the Canon warrants us in assuming that the practice was no new thing. Thus, then, the case stands: we have ante-Nicene practice as a comment on apostolic language; and taking into account that the laying on of hands was the uniform apostolic method of setting apart for officers in the Church, and, further, that women ever received the imposition of confirmation equally with the male sex, we think a candid judgment will incline to the view, that the best interpretation we can put upon S. Paul is that to which the Nicene canon guides us. We are not aware of any earlier authority equally clear.

The word 'ordination,' as applied to women, will come with a startling sound to many ears. It is necessary to distinguish the sense in which we apply it. Dr. Howson's words on the point, 'Deaconesses,' pp. 48—50, are as follows. After referring to the Nicene canon just mentioned, he appeals to the Apostolic Constitutions, the value of which testimony he more elaborately expounds in Appendix 4, and to the Protestant deaconesses of modern Germany, which we shall notice further on, as showing that the imposition of hands for these officers is sanctioned by ancient rule, and approved by recent practice; and adds:—

'But then a question arises as to the real import of this imposition of hands. The ceremony might have a double aspect. It might, according to circumstances, be a formal ordination, or simply express an act of solemn benediction. We are inclined to think that this distinction supplies the key to any difficulty which arises from the consideration of passages apparently conflicting. . . . On

¹ This seems to be the interpretation of the Canon which Bingham supports, though he asserts that Baronius and Valesius expound it otherwise. Dr. Howson on 'Deaconesses,' p. 48, favours Bingham's view.

the whole, it may be fairly concluded that in the general view of the primitive Church these female officers held a semi-ecclesiastical position. They were distinguished, by a very definite line of demarcation, from the clergy; they did not live in any monastic or conventual state; and yet, by reason of having prescribed duties connected with religion, they were, to some extent, separated from the laity.

In saying that their position is '*semi-ecclesiastical*,' and that they are '*to some extent* separate from the laity,' Dr. Howson traces his line of distinction less clearly than we could wish. Perhaps it might be safe to say that, whereas in clerical orders the laying on of hands implies, 1. the solemn setting apart for specific duties, and, 2. the conferring of spiritual authority of greater or less degree, the deaconess was ordained in the *first* sense only; and that she appertained to the clerical body by virtue of her being, like them, thus solemnly set apart, but was rated with the laity as regarded her lack of spiritual authority. This distinction seems to set the office in its due light, to clear it of superstitious value, and to guard it against depreciation.

It seems certain that, in many of the colonial branches of our Church, a pressing call seems likely to be made for deaconesses, especially in India. The question of the possibility of checking female infanticide is more closely bound up with it than with any detail of Church organization. Similarly the officiation of devout women in the baptism of adult members of their sex would be almost required, if our clergy there would only revert, in a climate eminently suited to it, to baptism by immersion, or at least by descent into the water. But this is another feature of the early prime of Christianity, which we seem to have silently expelled, in order to leave the advantage of a scriptural usage and '*visible form*' wholly with the Baptist sect.

The subject of '*sisterhoods*' was ably handled by Mr. Carter and Dr. Pusey. The former was able to claim for the Sisterhood at Clewer the sanction and control of the bishop of the diocese; who, however, from the president's chair, disallowed Mr. Carter's use of the term '*religious*' as specially describing such a life. The word is, unfortunately, contrasted with '*irreligious*,' just as the word '*regular*' is with '*irregular*;' and these suggestions of doubtful import it were best to exclude from any terminology adopted. It is not, we must admit, an easy thing to name aright. Perhaps '*unsecular*' might be allowed as inoffensive, save on the score of a certain clumsiness. The question seems chiefly verbal, but is not, therefore, unimportant to those who are anxious not to '*let their good be evil spoken of*.'

Mr. Carter distinguished among sisterhoods, as had long before been done among Christians at large, those which aim at the purely contemplative life, those which seek the purely practical, and those which seek to combine the two. He also pointed

out that family ties need not disqualify persons from joining themselves as associates. The language of this gentleman and of Dr. Pusey, though not avowing the condition of a devotee in the strict sense of one bound by a vow, yet seems to put a strain on the conscience hardly inferior in its practical effects. The former is reported as speaking of precedents in a 'remote antiquity,' when 'the vocation of a sister' was 'inseparable from a solemn profession and dedication to the work;' the latter as saying,—

'Every objection against the religious life as a permanent state, which the individual cannot leave without sin, denies, in fact, that she can have been called by God. It is not a question of vows; Abraham was under no vow, but it would have been sin in him to have disobeyed or to have turned back. A call of God, which a person on good grounds knows to be a call, cannot be abandoned or disobeyed without sin, and the forfeiture of the blessings which God introduced for them. They are sad histories, these forfeited vocations. But they pass away with the individual to the judgment-seat of Christ.'

The argument assumes that there can be no 'call' in this sense, save one which obliges in perpetuity. Surely this is presumptuous when applied to enrolment in a 'sisterhood.' Altered circumstances imply altered duties. The woman who, in obedience to such a 'call' as she believes in, enrolls herself in a 'sisterhood,' must needs do so in great ignorance of what she binds herself to. She cannot know what the conditions of her life may be made by those to whose guidance, as her superiors, she thereby yields herself. Abraham was bound to no human organization, or earthly superior. Here lies one fallacy in the argument. Dr. Pusey seeks to construe a simple call to serve God the Unchangeable in a closer walk, into an obligation to a human society, frail and mutable, and which may grow into monstrous diversity with the hopes and intentions of the 'sister,' but from which obligation she cannot withdraw without the penalty of a 'forfeited vocation.' Again, her own life's circumstances may vastly change. If she possessed property, it may, by a reverse of earthly fortunes, become the sole earthly stay to a family of suddenly made orphans, with all the claim upon her which kin and friendlessness can urge; yet if the tenet be true, she may not, if it has, with herself, been solemnly dedicated as an act of her 'vocation,' withdraw it from the funds of the sisterhood for their maintenance, or herself retire from it, to be the more effectual second parent to such claimants of her protecting care. Can any suppose that 'the Father of the fatherless and God of the widow' would indeed be pleased by such a Corban sacrifice as this?

The case is different as regards the simple 'Deaconess.' There the woman is supposed to appear before the bishop, after a sufficient probation has been passed. It is for him, aided by

the experience of the Church in all ages, and by faithful counsel as to her present wants, to judge what criteria of devotedness can be accepted as sufficient. The great practical difficulty lies in the possibility of the step of marriage being taken by a Deaconess, supposed set apart by imposition of hands. Theoretically the difficulty has no existence; for there may be many possible circumstances under which a Deaconess might serve God as effectually, or more effectually, by adopting the marriage tie than by remaining single. The position of a wife and mother combined, however, would too largely detract from her services to the Church; and the safest rule would be to fix such a limit of age as might place the question beyond doubt. Up to that limit, devoted women might be viewed as in a state of probation for their office, and their services, though not personally sealed by ordination, might be accepted in the same spirit as if they were ordained. 'Widows' always seem to occupy the prime place in this order, wherever it is mentioned in early Church history. 'Virgins,' however, are also mentioned; but from their being classed with 'widows,' we may presume that their age was not inferior. Tertullian (quoted by Bingham, Book II. xxii. 1, note 5) notes it a monstrosity that a young unmarried woman had obtained, in his time, admission among the ranks of the *viduatus*. These lines of primitive precedent seem commended by common sense as much as by venerable usage; but they are inconsistent with the practice of framing a sisterhood, consisting chiefly or largely of young persons, and stimulating their enthusiasm to contract engagements from which they are taught it is sinful to withdraw.

The peril is graver when compared with the practice which there are good grounds for supposing that he sanctions. The institution of the kind which has attracted most notoriety in this country is that founded by Miss Sellon, at Devonport. We believe that the words above ascribed to Dr. Pusey represent the spirit in which that house is administered, and the identical course which, as the spiritual adviser of it, he has uniformly pursued with its inmates. By representing the 'vocation' of the 'sister' as over-riding all ordinary obligations, and the withdrawal from which would be a sinful seeking of the world, or indulgence of fleshly weakness, there is danger of the exercise of a spiritual intimidation, and of a pressure on the isolated conscience, which may lead many to hold on through fear to what they embraced with hope, even if it may not cause some to droop and die under the austerities which it is reported Miss Sellon imposes, though, it is said, she does not share.

We quote from the 'Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy,' by Miss Goodman, who says,—

'Led chiefly by the wish to minister to untended suffering, in the summer of 1852 I joined the Sisters of Mercy at Devonport. As time went on, Miss Sellon thought fit to develop such conventual rules as pressed too heavily upon many of us; and therefore, after a sojourn of six years, I returned to my former occupation.'

After detailing various items of mortification in regard to clothing, silence, and the stedfast introversion of all thought and feeling by the life of constant meditation and self-examination, she adds,—

'It is scarcely possible to conceive the crushing effect this artificial mode of life has upon young, fresh hearts, or the bitterness it engenders in the minds of restless spirits. . . . But if the mental sufferings are terrible in health and vigour, they are increased tenfold by sickness. At such times it requires all our fortitude to accept and endure meekly and patiently lassitude and pain: we have no remaining strength wherewith to bear the tension of a highly artificial state of existence. . . . In sickness, the nun's companions all regard her with wondering indignation rather than sympathy and pity; they tell her perpetually that she must exert her self-control, and do battle valiantly with the lassitude which is weighing down every limb, or that she must rise above bodily pain, nor suffer her soul to be distracted by it.'

The practice in question is further illustrated by the case of one whose strength gave way under the yoke she bore; and whose treatment was as follows:—

'I heard a sister, who had helped her down a long flight of stone steps, say to her, on reaching the bottom, "You really ought to exert yourself more, dear; it is wicked of any one to give way in this manner." "Indeed, sister," she replied with the utmost meekness, "I do try and struggle; but I will try still more; it makes me very unhappy to see you displeased with me;" and she then went panting up a second flight, with all the energy she could summon. I said to the sister who had administered the rebuke, that I believed the invalid was in the last stage of consumption . . . the senior sister repeated her belief that she only required "rousing."'

Then follow some heart-sickening details of her gradual sinking amid the heartless neglect inspired by the rule of 'mercy'—of her begging the cook for an extra allowance of boiled milk and bread. 'Let me have it to-night, instead of to-morrow, when I shall not need it,' said the dying sister. 'The cook, a good-natured person,' complied, but found her dying when she took it up, and with some difficulty carried a message to that effect to a senior sister, who was engaged with Miss Sellon, and at first refused her request.

'Not to be repulsed, she rushed forward and said, "Sister —— is dying." They turned back together, but when they came to the bed-side, the sick sister was past speaking. The senior sister went immediately to fetch help, and returned with the sister who not many weeks before had helped the invalid down the stone steps, and who, as she drew near the bed, said, "You must rouse yourself, dear; it is only a fainting fit." The dying girl smiled serenely, and ere the smile had flitted from her face, her soul had entered where sorrow and sighing are done away: "For God shall wipe away the tears from their eyes."'

This is, doubtless, an extreme case; but what shall we think of a system where such a case is possible? Miss Goodman does not say, that in this case, any hint of a sinful forsaking of a vocation was given to keep the victim from change of air, and scene, and associations. There is no hint of this, any more than there is of medical, *i.e.* professional, care. The story reads as though the system of 'thorough,' as administered by Miss Sellon, was considered the all-efficacious treatment. If that system excludes ordinarily the precautions and palliations which medical skill provides for suffering men and women, and will not bend even to such a case as this, it must be an iron system indeed. Further, if these 'sisters,' whose profession, at least in one of its branches, is 'mercy,' treat each other thus on system and principle, when sickness comes home to themselves, what can be thought of their efficiency when tending the maladies of their ordinary patients? Is it wise to act on the principle to one *in extremis*, that he only 'wants rousing?' Such is the course ascribed to intensely tyrannous masters, when a slave sickens in an 'abolitionist' novel,—the overseer takes to 'rousing' him. Miss Sellon's establishment, it may be said, does not include the favourite instrument of the overseer. That may be so, yet, as regards principle, the parallel holds; and if the principle be wise and right, the more effective the material instrument of 'rousing' is—though that is a question of detail—the better is the principle carried out. How can they be in a high training for the inward temper, or outward acts of 'mercy,' who act thus to each other? If they tried their domestic system of 'rousing' upon their patients in their visits, they would soon find every door closed against them. We are not supposing that the same treatment is applicable to the outcasts of a great town, and to the highly spiritualized characters of the 'sisters;' but taking into account the levelling effects of weariness and pain, the difference is too great, and will shock any impartial mind. The whole exemplifies how a fanaticism, rooted in one point of practice, is prone to extend itself to others; those who begin by interpreting their engagement to the sisterhood as imposing a permanent obligation, end by stifling ordinary human feeling, and counting the conquest over it a proof of spiritual advancement. They may profess and practise 'mercy' without their gates, but it is a house of 'sacrifice' rather than 'mercy' within. It is only right to add that there is no proof of any such inhumanity at Clewer, or among any other sisterhood professing adherence to the Church of England. We should be only too glad to think Miss Goodman's charges could be explained away into any form of exaggeration or mis-statement, but the book has reached a third edition

without, we believe, any attempt being made to impugn its testimony.¹ This ought surely to be received as an admission of its substantial truth.

The very opposite system to that of which Miss Sellon's is an example, was advocated by Mr. Furse, curate of a large London parish, and by Mr. Hayne, a rural incumbent. They differ in so far as the latter includes a devotion for life under Episcopal authority and benediction,—in fact, a female diaconate; whilst the former says nothing of permanence in the calling of what he terms a 'parochial mission woman,' and seems merely to regard her as a subordinate district visitor, working by example among a social class of her own level, as well as by admonition and guidance. Attention was drawn by Mr. Pelham Dale to the 'North London Deaconesses Institution,' who appears to be its chaplain, and speaks of it as a free translation, not a literal copy, of the well-known Kaiserswerth order. He stipulates for a life service, not, however, to overrule in all cases the tendency of a woman of marriageable age to marry, but generally to be understood as exclusive of that tie. Mr. Seymour dwelt on the recognition of Sisterhoods by Convocation, and on the diversity which might co-exist with harmony in the varied fields of female work in the Church. The differences of position and of obligation between the deaconess, the sister, and the parochial mission woman, he justly regarded as likely to furnish a larger number with a special province adapted to their respective opportunities.

The Bishop, in summing up the debate, laid emphasis on the importance of no mistaken impression getting abroad, as to what the Congress had stamped with its approval. He thought all wished for the shelter of authority, and the aid of system to be extended to those women who wished so to devote themselves; but that to include in that system a permanent vow of celibacy, he thought was equally against the wish of all. It was unscriptural, and full of danger. Nor should he, as bishop, be willing to take part in any sisterhood, of which such vows formed a rule. Such vows, he thought, really implied a lower, not a higher standard of devotion. The only promise which could fitly be given, was one of obedience to rules, so long as the individual remained a member of the society. The abuse of the devotional life had proceeded from perpetual vows, whether

¹ In a letter in the *Guardian* newspaper of July 9, Miss Goodman mentions her willingness to meet and satisfy the cavils of an objector, who in the columns of that journal had impugned the truth of her statements. We have heard nothing of her challenge being taken up, and infer that the general aspersions upon her veracity cannot be sustained by particular and personal objections, and, therefore, that her statements are unassailable.

as regards person or property. He had a deep objection also to the word 'religious,' as used to describe the life in question. It implied that the state of matrimony was an inferior way of serving God. The impression produced by the Bishop's words seemed most profound; nor has any one point been more deeply fixed in the apparently unanimous resolve of the Congress than this. It produced on the following day an attempt to shape it permanently in a resolution, and affirm it by a vote. We have already stated the course which the discussion on this point took; what is now added will show how the point itself emerged. The fact of its returning to the surface of debate next day confirms what has just been said regarding the extent to which it had fixed the interest of the Congress.

We have already hinted that the laying on of hands, as applied to women, will shock the sensitiveness of some of our brethren; but that what they take for Protestant scruples, if scruples they feel, are not shared by others who are as remote from Romanizing tendencies as they, may be inferred from the practice at Kaiserswerth, which is, we believe, as follows:—

'The ceremony begins with a hymn. Then follows the Consecration address, in which the pastor recalls the texts from Romans xvi. 1, 2, from which it appears that females also acted as servants or *deaconesses* of the Church, and shows the usage to have been continued down to the fourth century, when forty deaconesses were still to be found at Constantinople. He then presents the deaconesses of the day, as about to take office under a similar character and authority; as such, being found worthy after a long probation, he accepts them in the name of the Holy Trinity. He places again before their eyes the various duties they undertake, viz., to be servants to the Lord Jesus; to be servants unto the sick and poor, and to be servants unto each other. After an exhortation on these several duties, the pastor says:—

"In the sight of God and this congregation I ask each of you now: Are you resolved truly to fulfil these duties of deaconesses in the fear of the Lord, according to His holy Word?"

The deaconesses answer, "Yes."

"Jesus Christ, the Chief Priest and Bishop of your souls, seal your confession and vow, and acknowledge you to all eternity as His own. Amen."

"Draw near, and stretch forth to me and your superior the right hand in token of your promise."

"Kneel down."

The pastor then gives the imposition of hands, and adds:—

"May God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, three Persons in one God, bless you; may He establish you in the Truth until death, and give you hereafter the Crown of Life. Amen."—*National Miscellany*, December, 1853, p. 96.

The word 'vow' here refers, we are informed in a foot-note, only to the *fulfilment* of the duties undertaken so long as they shall be professed, and the only sense in which the sisterhood of Clewer, according to the Bishop of Oxford, admits of similar engagements. Many 'practical difficulties' may, if felt and

foreseen by any of the more apprehensive amongst us, be solved by the exemplar of Kaiserswerth. Of course, the validity of the pastor's imposition of hands does not enter into our question, which is purely subjective as regards the scruple we are supposing. It suffices for our argument, that whatever in that Protestant community passes current as spiritual authority, is used in consecrating these deaconesses, and that they minister under its sanction.

We dismiss this important subject with one remark, called forth by a letter in *The Guardian* of July 30, from one who took part in its discussion at the Congress, Mr. Hayne, of Buckland, near Plymouth. He says:—

‘Two ideas seem now presented to us.

‘First, that the deaconess should be a woman set apart by the bishop for works of charity, under no special rule, and unconnected with any community, but choosing her sphere of labour, living either alone or not, and working as long as she pleases, perhaps with a salary.

‘The second is, that the deaconess should be a member of a well-constituted sisterhood, in which she has been trained in all works of charity, &c. &c.’

He seems to exaggerate the isolation to an entirely needless degree in the first case supposed, and to impart to his view of the character of the first ideal a tone of self-will, if not of caprice, inconsistent, indeed, with wholesome work, but quite gratuitous as regards the theory of her position. Why should a woman, ‘set apart by the Bishop for certain work,’ be wholly free to ‘choose her sphere of labour?’ why, seeing that the parish is the unit of organization generally prevalent, is she to be ‘unconnected with any community?’ Her life ‘alone or not’ must be at her own choice, unless it be meant to make a sisterhood the *sine qua non* of office; and whether in a sisterhood or out of it, she will certainly ‘work as long as she pleases,’ and no longer.

This eminent advocate of woman's work seems rather to warp the possible outlines of useful working models, by drawing them according to his preconceived notions. We might grant, for argument's sake, that the deaconess of a sisterhood follows a more excellent way. Yet the extent of detachment which that position involves from natural ties is a surrender which many, very fit for the office, ought not to make. The parish may find a place for her, and when highly organized, is sure to need her. The bishop's ordination may set her solemnly apart, and the parish-priest's guidance direct her labours. Few parishes will, when it has learned their uses, find one such deaconess sufficient. Their life will certainly be drawn into common; where the check of domestic ties does not lay an embargo on it, between these two poles the question of how and where to live will be settled.

But the false assumption of these views is, that we must needs

begin with a code of fixed rules, instead of working from principles, and letting rules, as is safer, spring up beneath the guidance of practice. The *trop gouverner* is likely to stifle the wholesome life of the movement with which we are concerned. Perhaps the only points which need be fixed by rule at first are a limit of age and a form of admission to office. All else might be left to the bishop in his diocese, and the priest in his parish. The topics of dress, salary, and social station, are such as may be safely left to solve themselves; that of sisterhoods or not, may be left to the needs and resources of the church in each neighbourhood, to the views of the bishop, and the temper of the laity.

Hardly inferior in interest, if secondary in importance, to the question of woman's work, is that of the duty of the Church towards the vast masses of disaffected or semi-heathen population, especially in great towns. The discussion on how to reclaim 'the alienated classes' to the Church resolves itself chiefly into the battle of free or open seats in churches. We think the term is an unhappy one: what 'classes' are 'alienated?' The ceasing to attend Divine worship is not alienation from the Church. Yet, so far as we can gather from the papers or speeches which did not take the wooden view of the subject—that of the benches, namely, and doors—the classes intended are those which have either lost or never found the habit of attending at church. That there is no alienation on their part seems proved by the readiness with which they yield to earnest efforts made for their souls' good, as testified by what fell from Mr. Cadman and Mr. C. M. Robins. Certainly, so far as 'alienation' has become a 'class' feature, it marks the retailers' class far more than the weekly labourers'. And this compact body of retailers it is which adopts the pew-system in its most highly developed form, that is to say, as it exists in the Dissenting conventicle. The tradesman likes to have a place that he can call his own, and to settle at once all questions of ownership by producing his receipt for the rent. His pew is his castle; and the man who has fully imbibed this spirit is, to say nothing of heresy and schism, practically alienated from the rule of charity and godly order. Yet even amongst the tradesmen of large towns, a respectable minority, to say the least, adhere to the Church. Probably the pew-system has had a tendency to keep many such in the Church. When the Church narrows her practice to the system which as a class they prefer, they are willing to abide by her. We say this without prejudice to the goodly number, we may still hope, who cling to her teaching as distinct from their personal accommodation and importance, and we state merely what may be taken to be the general rule. The question after all, in its practical bearings, depends mainly on what men have been used to.

Prejudices are sure to beset a change as such, whether in itself just and judicious or not. Whether any one system would be acceptable among all congregations, even in towns, is a question which experience alone can decide. Still, the objection to the gross injustice of the arrangement by which all, save a fraction of the parishioners, are shut out from all benefit by the parish church seems insuperable; and few congregations, we think, could continue so hardened in selfishness as to wish it perpetuated against an earnest and sustained appeal. The pew-system is really a question of detail, though, from its being the form in which the false principle mostly develops itself, it acquires a prominence to which it is hardly entitled. The falsity in question is the assumed right of a third, a fifth, or a fiftieth part of a parish to exclude the rest. Where the extent of the church is so small that such fractions only can be accommodated, any granting of seats in occupancy for more than a single service, unless by some compromise based on a rule of rotation, involves the same injustice. The churchwardens may, of course, find, after a protracted experiment, that practically only a small number of the families in the parish have church-going habits; but if they make that an excuse for an exclusive allotment among such families, they sentence the rest to perpetual banishment, and seal the church-doors against the return of the penitents, if such they should ever become. Pastoral neglect, leaving them in their slothful desuetude of Christian duty, rivets the bond of habit. There are perhaps enough comers to fill the church, and he who looks on the church walls as limiting his spiritual care, except in the case of a summons from the sick, completes the mischief which began in scanty church-room and unfair allotment. The majority of the parish become virtually abandoned to take their chance of dissent or heathenism. This is what any one may see in numerous instances among the great towns of England; though less frequently, let us hope, than forty or even twenty years ago.

Canon Trevor was certain that 'the introduction of free and 'unappropriated seats at York would empty the churches of all 'the old parishioners,' and thinks that wherever, as in some cases mentioned, the movement succeeds, those cases are to be viewed as 'exceptional.' He should have stated before he sat down the ratio borne by church accommodation to population in the city quoted. Where that ratio is one of equality or more, individuals can, without obvious injustice, parcel out among themselves the area which is the common right of all; but the moment that ratio falls below par, the injustice of exclusion begins. And if five hundred persons are seated commodiously, and the five hundred and first excluded, we hold that this ar-

rangement infringes the dictum of Sir S. Romilly, as quoted by Mr. Claughton, that 'the ground-floor of the church is the common right of the parishioners; the genius of the great lawyer did not soar to the aerial heights of the galleries, but of their right on *terra firma* he had no doubt.' If the odd man is only driven upstairs, the allotment in occupancy is on this view bad in law; the only equitable way being that where space suffices, all should have an equal share, and where space fails, all should have an equal chance. Hence it is perfectly possible that the parochial vice of indulging a part to the exclusion of the majority may prevail at York, and that the attempt to disturb that part might issue in their indignant desertion of the churches at the outrage on their fancied rights, though it really embodied a vindication of the rights of others, long dormant and ignored. Even if the measure had the effect contemplated, it would at any rate have a hopeful chance for those whom we supposed previously perhaps excluded. A strong repugnance amongst influential persons is always an argument against suddenly disturbing an arrangement with which they have grown up, and which had its seat in the place where their grandfathers were children. Very likely it is only during the last three generations that, under pressure of a new population, the gross extent of the injustice may have been committed. Thus a system once practically consistent with justice, as where accommodation was commensurate with demand, may become a violation of it by a course of events over which those interested in maintaining it had no control. Such examples of hardship arising from vicissitude should be dealt with tenderly where they occur, but their existence is no less a warning against such appropriations as give occasion to them. A wholesome rule is mentioned as prevailing in S. Giles' parish, Oxford, to the effect that, although the seats *are* appropriated, the parishioners have agreed to consider them all free, if unoccupied at the moment when Divine service commences. This rule, if it could be adopted wherever a system of appropriation prevails, would deprive it of much of its mischief, besides the premium on punctual attendance which it holds out.

We suspect that laziness on the part of the churchwardens has had a good deal to do with the abuse in question. They preferred to make the arrangement which best consulted their own ease at whatever cost to the rights of outsiders. They were, of course, men taken from the laity, and imbued in past times with its feelings of contented acquiescence in whatever made up the most comfortable interior. Hence arose vicious customs, of which it is difficult to affirm that they override the law or not; for they render its broadest doctrine nugatory, while probably, if the point were raised, they might be proved illegal.

But, indeed, a bad custom, widely prevalent, to the contrary of sound legal maxims, argues a worse social state as regards the point in question than a merely bad state of the law; for it shows that there is a bad condition of public feeling, a state of silent revolt against wholesome rules which prevailed in healthier times. This is just the condition from which the Church is now rousing herself. The apathy is departing, but the arrangements which sprang naturally out of it have taken strong hold of the ground. Rents for pews; pews viewed as attached to houses, and included in the whole rentable value; pews appropriated to persons who prefer the profit of letting them to the benefit of using them—a form of lay simony which was duly exposed by a Mr. H. Jones, an incumbent from apparently a manufacturing district—pews conferring a qualification as a freeholder and a vote for the county, and which fetched 100*l.* each in public auction—all these cumber naturally the way of returning justice. Besides the iniquities of traffic, there are the carnalities of comfort requiring only exposure, if anywhere they still exist, to be reprobated. We hear, from Mr. Hubbard, of pews as high as a man's head, and having outside each a brass plate with the name of the occupier. Stoves, with poker, shovel, and tongs, were the regular 'squire's pew' appendages. At Darlington, the prospect of the area of the church was that of a 'sea of green baize'; at Oxford the Mayor, when churchwarden of S. Giles, had to go to the door and knock for admittance into the pew of a sensitively exclusive parishioner, who would require a previous certification of who the candidate for admission was.

Still most, or perhaps all, of these more glaring abuses were spoken of as things past and gone, and were quoted rather as a proof of progress than a token of defect. But there remains the one massive impediment in the onward course of religion—the intrusion of private rights in the place of public worship; and this is in many cases aggravated by the fact that the rents accruing are the chief or sole means of maintenance and support for the incumbent and his church.

Archdeacon Denison suggested the account of the origin of the appropriated system, when, in the course of his argument in favour of appropriation, he said:—

'Will any man at the meeting, be he *rusticus* or *urbanus*, tell me that he ever saw a poor or a rich man in a church that did not like to sit always in the same place? Will any man tell me if he ever saw a poor man go and take a rich man's place when the rich man was not there? Therefore, I believe, do what you will to make what you call wholly free and unappropriated churches, you cannot do it; it is contrary to the English nature, and, what is more, it is contrary to our principles, because, when a churchwarden is directed to arrange the seats of a parish church, he is told to seat the parishioners according to their order and degree, and I, for one, believe that is what the poor man

wishes. If you talked to him of wholly free and unappropriated churches, he would tell you that is not what he wanted. What he wants is a place; but he does not want to be stuffed up where he thinks, in his own natural delicacy of mind, he ought not to be.

This means to say that an Englishman likes a thing to be his own, and disrelishes whatever he shares in common. Our people are indeed too keenly sensible of the differences which separate man from man, and too little sensitive to what all men have alike. This, existing, untempered and exaggerated, is the root of the love, where it is to be found, of an appropriated church, and of the repugnance to a free one. It is not at once mere selfishness in the sense in which that word means something wrong, but it is a feeling out of which selfishness easily grows. Hence we go on in successive stages of development, each carrying this principle of English nature a step further, from benches to pews with doors, from doors to locks and door-plates, thence to family boxes, curtained snuggeries, and cushioned dormitories, suggestive of a different admonition than 'watch and pray.' The same feeling breeds that mutual repulsiveness of rich and poor, that the same planks, as the Archdeacon testifies, cannot hold them even in succession. The poor man would feel his corduroys tickle him all over if they pressed the bench on which broadcloth or kerseymere had reposed that day week before. There may be rural sanctuaries where this natural delicacy thus afflicts the parishioners, and we doubt not the Archdeacon drew from real life. This is the sort of feeling we reach by a constant tradition of squires' pews, with ancestors in effigy, and stoves, with poker, shovel, tongs, bellows, and coal-scuttle. Of course the feeling exists, and churchwardens would be more than men if they did not recognise and share it. They like to be on the popular side, though they are the 'bishop's officers.' A free-seated church is unpopular, because the poor man may possibly find himself in a seat which a rich man would like to have.

We cannot here omit to notice that Archdeacon Denison begs the question when he says, 'Whoever saw a poor man go and take a rich man's place?' It is no man's place, rich or poor, till appropriation comes in. When appropriation has been consecrated by usage, a man's pew is looked on as his drawing-room. A poor man cannot take a rich man's seat in an unappropriated church, for, where all is free, claims and tenures are dead and gone, and there is no right left to invade. He may take a place which a rich man would like to have, and there is no doubt which of the two would give way. So, in order, then, to avoid this collision of Hodge and the squire, with no buffer between them, the space must, it seems, be appropriated. Still, if there be room for all who want it, no one will be aggrieved. But, on the opposite supposition, mark the consequence:—All who are

not among the lucky few whose ease the wardens, by the same golden rule, consult first, must be thereby virtually disfranchised of their parish church. Now, when matters stand thus, we think a person must have gone some way in the dogma that 'whatever is, is right,' to acquiesce in these results of his principles. The first Christians had all things in common. We seem to have gone so very far from them, that we cannot have even the floor of the church in common. We authorize selfishness where charity should reign pure, and seek something which we can know as our own, even in the house of God. According to Mr. Hubbard, a pious tailor, an acquaintance of his, wanted to inflict corporal punishment on his sons, and, therefore, wished the pew-walls high, on the well-known principle *ne pueros coram populo*; probably the boys wanted to cut their names on the said walls, and, therefore, *they* would like them high; thus each had his reasons. An English farm-lad, with a new knife, would cut his name on the Communion-table if he could get a chance. The Archdeacon wishes a place for every man, and every man in his place, and every man's feelings spared. No hobnails to catch crinolines. The 'rich and poor' are to 'meet together,' but not too close. This reminds us of an epitaph—

'Here lie I beside the door,
Here I lie because I'm poor;
Further in the more they pay,
Here lie I as well as they.'

The Archdeacon probably would not sanction rented seats, though he wishes them appropriated; but by merely substituting 'sit' for 'lie,' we have here as complete a description of the pew-rent system as could be given, perhaps, in four lines. We cannot altogether abolish squires' pews, nor oust the manor-house in miniature from the church—that would be a case of *lesa majestas*; but we should like *this* to be done, and we think it might be done, viz., for every other boxed seat in the church to be thrown down, and replaced by the best open benches with low backs which can be obtained, and the fortification of seigniorial privacy left standing, confronting the pulpit in solitary grandeur, the sole wigwam of the spiritual wilderness. We cannot but fancy that its entrenchments would be carried before long. The public opinion of Christian men would be powerful against them, as the priestly trumpet-blast against the wall of Jericho. An organist, when performing, may be regarded, perhaps, as a dangerous piece of machinery, and needing to be 'boxed off;' but there should no other box be allowed in the church. An excellent reply to some of the difficulties apprehended from open seats was given by Professor Burrows:—

'It was said that families would not be able to sit together! If they come in time, they may sit together in the best place; and if they do not come in time, they can sit together in the worst place; and I should like to know what practical evil results from that. The real fact is, that nothing so tends to make people come in good time to church as the desire to be along with their families in good places. We have heard from a gentleman—a layman—that it would be a very practical evil if a gentleman was to find himself between a chimney-sweeper and a miller. For my part, I should be extremely glad to find myself between ever so many chimney-sweepers and ever so many millers. And that not only from the feeling that I should be there amongst those alienated classes whose absence I so deeply regret, but because I feel certain that the evil which has been spoken of is practically nothing; for this chimney-sweeper and this miller would be the very persons—the one to wash himself and the other to beat himself clean, before coming to sit down in the House of God. There is nothing that so tends to give the poor self-respect and encouragement to cleanliness, and which so enables them to feel themselves at home in the Church of God, as the fact that they can go and sit where they like in the church. We heard an expression from Archdeacon Denison which, again, I may say, perhaps, applies to agricultural districts, but which I certainly hope will not apply to new churches, and not long to our old parish churches in the cities, which was this—that the poor man never liked to take the rich man's place. I hope that in the new churches, at least, we shall not know what it is to have a rich man's place, and then we shall find no difficulty about the poor man's dislike to taking it.'

Mr. Brett, of Stoke Newington, in the discharge of his duties as churchwarden, had actually encountered that portent—more formidable, one would think, than a bull in a china-shop—a real chimney-sweeper in a church; and it appears that the man knew the Creed and Lord's Prayer, and joined heartily in them. Ought not anybody who so met him to have been simply thankful to God for the sight? The prevalence of any other frame of mind (and evidently it does prevail, and is represented by Mr. Charles Higgins) shows that a cold fastidiousness among the brethren of clean skin and linen to match meets at least half-way the 'delicate' susceptibility which the Archdeacon of Taunton discovers in the poor. It is sad that men should feel the quality of their coats so much more keenly than their common heritage of sin and need of a Saviour. The words of Mr. Brett upon the churchwarden's share in the scandal are worth extracting. They testify against the pompous parish patron of the poor, frowning over the edge of his churchwarden's pew against tattered intruders in to the highly respectable congregation of his brother grocers in 'Sunday' costume, and, while he keeps his neighbour at arm's length or more, leaving the duty of seating the parishioners, which is *his*, to the beadle and the pew-opener, whom he would not deprive of their chance of a shilling. They are as follows:—

'I can unequivocally assert, that if only *churchwardens will do their duty*—if they will take the trouble, Sunday after Sunday, to see that the persons who come into their church shall be seated, and to act upon the principle that be

who comes first shall have the best seat, I believe all the stiff English prejudices against free seats, and in favour of sitting in fixed places, would vanish at once, and we should have no more difficulty upon this question. . . . Allow me to ask how is the churchwarden, with a population of eight thousand people round, to allot seats to *all* the parishioners? I say to them all, "Come in, and you may have your seat; any one, however poor, come in and take any seat that you may find vacant." When I have done that I feel that I have done my duty; and I am sure if other churchwardens will do the same, next year, when we meet, we shall find that the free-church movement has made rapid strides."

Mr. Higgins' words, on the contrary, have a singular lack of logical cogency, or rather they tend to prove the very opposite of what he maintains. 'So far as my experience goes,' he says, 'all the dissenting chapels over the country are filled with pews and nothing else.' Hence, he thinks, there must 'be a fallacy in the opinion that large classes are kept away, from the circumstance of many of the country churches having pews in them.' Does he not know that the dissenters seek *one class*, viz. that which can pay; that the pew system is, from its precise adaptation to the wants of that class, proportionably unsuited to the rest of the social system; and that in proportion as it is sectionally useful it is generally mischievous?

He then goes on to the great 'chimney-sweep and miller' question—we are thankful to Professor Burrows for shaking the dust out of that bag—and concludes with an exhortation, of all things most *mal à propos*, to the clergy, to 'teach the gospel of Christ patiently, fervently, and affectionately.' Why, if the clergy did not do that, the difficulty would never arise. It is precisely *because* they are so occupied that they feel the question press. They are beating up recruits from the highways and hedges of the country, or from the streets and lanes of the city; but the cry is, there is *no* room. Church space is preoccupied; there is not a square inch for baker or chimney-sweep. Further, the more assiduous and effectual the clergy are, the more is Mr. Higgins' chance multiplied of a sweep 'coming betwixt the wind and his' charity. He must 'draw the line somewhere,' and he draws it in the shape of a row of very stiff-backed benches in the middle aisle, with extensions into the more comfortless regions of the church. Promiscuous poverty is dangerous to men who worship in good coats. But let us be thankful that he was the only man who expressed such opinions in the Congress, or who, while unctuously lecturing the clergy on the discharge of their duty, objected to the poor, as such, worshipping side by side with the rich. So long as the Church contains a churchwarden of such views, let him at any rate afford a proof of the comprehensiveness of view which rules at such meetings, that even he is not excluded or silenced.

Among other significant facts was the presence and speech of

Lord Ebury, who was wholly in favour of the free-system, and who believed that, by attempting, twenty years ago, to apply it to S. George's, Hanover Square, of which he was then churchwarden, he 'made the very hairs of the whole parish to stand on end.'

Mr. Huntington, also, of Manchester, confirmed the popularity of free seats and an offertory in that city, against close pews and rents.

Of course these gentlemen spoke from an experience gathered in churches where squires' pews are unknown. Wide social disparities exist in the country, which insensibly shade off into each other in great towns; although S. George's, Hanover Square, may well be supposed an exception to every rule. Hence, practically, it is often possible in the country to consult people's feelings who come to church, without injustice to others who are absent; but the principle that freedom is better than appropriation is applicable to all.

The President seemed to us to sum up with less than his usual clearness of insight on this question. He said, 'there is no appropriation' in arranging that the same seat shall be filled by the same person on several successive Sundays. There is, however, a growing sense of imperfect ownership begotten in the mind by a regular use, sustained, as he supposes, even for a month. Certainly, a man unseated after four or five turns of occupancy feels a stronger sense of deprivation than he who has had but one turn of use. The English character tends to convert such usage, too, into an indefinite right: a man takes as a matter of course a place which he has held regularly before, and others equally of course shrink from taking it before him; and this tendency it is which favours appropriation, and against which the churchwardens must watch-fully guard. The safest plan is, surely, Mr. Brett's, to stop all possibility of rights thus accruing, by declaring the perfect freedom of the first comer to take any seat in the church. The bishop's difficulty of fashionable neighbourhoods invaded by extra-parochial crinolines, or sea-side churches swamped by the influx of August cockneys, is one peculiar to such comparatively rare localities, and ought not to warp the rule for other places which teem only with their own poor. We believe that no system, open or close, will really deter a daring inroad of fashionable women. The thing is not to be done, save indirectly, by making the church and its services less æsthetically attractive. Those who insist on piling up every dazzling effect which marbles and stained-glass can yield, and adding a well-drilled choir in spotless surplices, must be content to have their reward in being a 'show church.' Still, after all, if the poor

will only come soon enough, they cannot be worsted. If the rich are willing and able to make greater sacrifices in coming early than the poor, they must be allowed the advantage in a perfectly free system of 'first come first served.' Yet, even here, when the parish is well officered, and the officers know their own, it may be possible to devise some check. The peril is too rare and doubtful to overthrow a principle essentially sound. What is to be done with a church which suddenly doubles or trebles its congregation in the dog-days? is a more formidable question; but it is clearly nothing but a pure accident, arising from circumstances which can only here and there find place. It may be as impossible to solve such a question satisfactorily, as it would if a parish church were suddenly swept away by flood or fire. But to found an argument on it, as regards the general question of free or open seats, is clearly to make a rule out of an exception. Watering-places which are so *very* popular can generally afford their own relief by engaging extra clergy in buildings temporarily licensed for the purpose. Sometimes a floating church would be at once a cheap relief and an agreeable variety; but such places may surely be left to take care of themselves. At any rate, rich and poor, on a perfectly free system, will always find each his proper level in proportion to his earnestness.

We will conclude this portion of our subject by some remarks from the paper read by Mr. Herford, which is the leading article on this subject in the Report of the proceedings of the Congress. He is speaking of the alternatives sometimes adopted instead of the plan which he recommends; they consist of the plan of free seats reserved in a church where most of the seats are let, or of seats let at a nominal rent, to fall within the means of the poor man to pay:—

'The objections to free seats are—1. That most of the unpewed classes object to occupy them, even if similar to the pews; and that a marked distinction between them, especially drives away the independent operatives. 2. That if a *large* proportion of the church is wholly free, the plan operates to confine the support of the clergyman and parochial institutions to a very small minority of the parishioners, while in free and open churches all are stimulated to do their utmost; and if a *small* proportion only is free, the boon to the poor is of no real value. In free churches the inconvenience of crowding is felt by the well-to-do, and leads them to provide more churches, from which, in the same way, new congregations will in due time "hive off." But in pewed churches the want of church-room for the operative classes never appears, because they may not sit in the pews, and will not go to the free seats. In fine, if a church holding 1,000 is not large enough for a population of 5,000 people, it cannot be right to appropriate all but a third of it to a fifth or a tenth of the parishioners. The common phrase, "leaving a competent number of free seats for the poor," is simply unmeaning in reference to the ordinary population of a town parish.

'The "nominal rent" scheme is still more conspicuously a delusion. For if

a parish containing 5,000 persons or 1,000 families, with a church holding 1,000 persons, divided by a line down the middle equally between the rented and unappropriated seats, after one-half, say 100 pews, are let to 100 pew-renting families, only 100 free and unappropriated pews would be left for 900 non-pew-renting families. This is bad enough. But suppose these 100 free pews to be appropriated to the exclusive use of 100 or even 200 of those 900 families at low rents—this would leave 600 or 700 families, or fully two-thirds of the entire population, without a seat, or any means whatsoever of attending public worship, in a building which is theirs, designed for all alike by the National Church.

Mr. Cadman's experience was rich in encouragement: but we cannot but think that he takes a somewhat too sanguine view of his own successes. He opposed the discription of parishes, and justly, for so to divide is to isolate and weaken. Often such divisions leave heart-burnings behind. They take too much in wealth, or leave too much in population. But above all they tend to dissipate the *vis unita fortior*, and split up the support derivable from a centre. His plan of beginning with a temporary and short service has been found, he says, to issue in a demand for a permanent and full one. Light and air have penetrated the slighted and unstirred mass, and it is found to teem with spiritual life. Thus he plants colonies in the wilderness, but nurses each colony with care, till it becomes strong with independent vitality. The mother Church is the parent stem: from her he bends down, at due distance, a fruitful bough, which quickens, with a root of its own, and becomes a fresh point of departure for ministerial organization, yet retaining its connexion with the central trunk. When thus sought,

'The non-attendants at Divine worship are not unapproachable. There may be an outward crust of indifference, prejudice, alienation, and sinful habit to break through; but let there be the determination to break through it, made in a spirit of truth, and faith, and love, and very precious ore will be found not far beneath the surface.'

On certain grave and wide subjects of discussion which followed, such as 'Mission Work,' 'National Education,' and 'Synodal Action in the Colonies,' we regret to be unable to enter, owing to imperative considerations of space. All that we can do is, to suggest to our readers that, to discuss, with any approach to satisfactory fulness, all the questions debated at the Congress, would probably require at least an entire number of this Review: and that it was better, therefore, to handle somewhat at large the more interesting of the leading subjects, and to give, as we now proceed to do, a few sketches of certain minor and collateral topics.

The Rev. W. F. Hobson contributed a paper of considerable interest at one of the sectional meetings, on 'the Church in the

Army.' He confirms us in the impression that in times of peace, when such distinction as the army merits is not to be had, it often obtains, through its least worthy members, such a notoriety as it neither covets nor deserves. The violent and desperate characters who scare civil life, and fill the police-magistrate's court at any military station with a surplus of the worst cases, are unfortunately the specimens by which civilians have to judge. Hence the popular idea of a soldier is that of a glorious fellow, whom one would rather keep at a distance from. Mr. Hobson presents the counterbalance to this generally diffused impression in the following:—

'The number of right *well-disposed* men; the many of *general steadiness and good conduct*; the commonness of *mild, quiet, inoffensive* men, who are not *fierce warriors*, nor "drinking, cursing, and fighting," as soldiers were once; the many who from such characteristics puzzle one to account for their being soldiers at all—these are truly gratifying to find out. All this is encouraging, hopeful; and as before, with regard to morality, I am *not* afraid to say that the amount of real religion in the army is at least equal to that of similar classes outside. And this must increase, through God's blessing, upon the faithful ministry of right earnest men who love the soldier, know his thoughts, circumstances, habits, and general character, and who *sympathise* with him; and whom the soldier in his turn repays with respect, attention, *trust*, and not seldom with the visible fruit of a better life. Nowhere is "a good man and true," as a chaplain, more respected than in the army, by officers and men; he is sure of his *full value* (more than he dare claim for himself) in their estimation; for his office's sake he is looked on as *apart* from all else, although of late, unfortunately, *uniformed*, and *ranked* as an *officer*—a change which is in reality a hindrance and not a help; and I believe very many of our brethren in parishes would confess and lament that they are permitted to *see* less extensive signs of their influence than ourselves, fewer particular cases of their "labour not being in vain."

The writer rejoices over the rescue of 'old S. Mary's church' at Dover, in the Castle, a building coeval with S. Alban 'the Martyr,' to sacred purposes, which 'for one hundred and fifty years past had been disused and in ruin, and desecrated,' whilst service was being 'held at times in the open air with the drum-head for a pulpit;' a rescue which he ascribes to the loving zeal of the late Lord Herbert. The liveliness of his feelings on this head is more marked from the ill-found character of camp worship in respect of sacred buildings, 'chapels' being in promiscuous use for 'schools.' Attendance at church is matter of regulation once a Sunday, the second service being voluntary; besides this,

'Christmas Day and Good Friday are alone days of authoritative service. I have introduced a service on Ascension Day, and obtain an attendance of two hundred and fifty or three hundred men; also on Ash Wednesday, and on Fridays in Lent, with a like good attendance. This is one advantage in the army, that all being under command and accessible, we can, with delicate management, through commanding officers, always secure a good attendance on a day on which a chaplain thinks it right to have a service; but of course

all this is voluntary and permissive, and it would hardly do as yet to apply this expectation to an ordinary Saint's day.'

The writer dates the more vigorous religious administration and more adequate provision for the spiritual wants of the army from the Crimean war, from which time 'the chaplain obtained a standing and estimation in the army unknown before.' The number of chaplains previously in commission having no other charge was before that time five or six, it is now fifty-five, besides Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, who number respectively eighteen and eight. The increased frequency of Confirmation, occasionally received by officers of high distinction at the head of their men, and larger though still scanty numbers at the Holy Communion, and further, on the whole an improved morality, are among the fruits and proof of reality in the work which Mr. Hobson records. The standard which soldiers on the average bring with them to the regiment must be taken into account by those who estimate military morals. The choicest plants of a curate's culture seldom, we fancy, aspire—or condescend, shall we say?—to enlist. It is, in the great majority of cases, the louts and rif-raffs of the village, or the still coarser scum of a town, the wild and thriftless lads who have neither prospects nor character to lose, who listen most largely to the wheedling talk of the recruiting sergeant. Discipline often does a work upon these hard natures which nothing else could do, raises their intelligence and implants a practical sense of duty and honour, of obedience, allegiance, and self-devotion, though often tarnished and inadequate. Better often for their moral natures that they should rough it amid the random influences of camp life, than that they should alternately slink about the farm-yard and sot in the village-bar. The traditions of evil in the military profession are no doubt rank and tenacious; how should they not be so with such a spiritual apparatus as existed down to 1854? but those thoroughly selfish, idle, and obdurate lumps into which the worse specimens of agricultural life are prone to harden, are often beyond the reach of the wholesome influences of squire and parson, even when most closely allied. The military chaplain has to fine the dregs of the parish, and if he succeeds in purifying some, that is all so much clear gain to the good, even though there be ever a lower dreg to be drafted off to 'the bad.'

Professor Burrows gives, strange to say, a much more dismal picture of the moral interior of the workhouse than Mr. Hobson does of that of the camp. The chief weak points to which he draws attention are the want of proper classification and separation among the women, and the want of properly trained nurses for the sick-wards. As regards the first point, every workhouse,

it seems, contains the elements to need, and with due supervision to form, both a reformatory and a penitentiary; and the thorough admixture of all classes, the mere novices and the graduates in evil, together, gives the most frightful stimulus to the wholesale propagation of corruption. The Professor makes a stand on behalf of the unbefriended ones, whose years, as they emerge from childhood, gradually bring them within the range of temptation; he would shelter decency and purity in woman, placed at a fearful disadvantage, without the fostering wing of domestic love or the threatening deterrent of the social ban.

'To rescue them by preventive measures must commend itself to every reasonable mind. Whether this can be best done by taking them out of the workhouses, or by so far improving these by classification as to render them fit abodes for such persons, is a question we cannot now stop to discuss; but at all events for the present there can be no doubt that the only successful and practicable plan is to remove them from an atmosphere that appears to be absolutely fatal to the character of the young.'

Further, as regards the head of nurses, he states that—

'The almost incredible number of 5,161 die every year in the forty-six workhouses of the metropolitan district alone, and 50,000 *sick* pass through them in the same time. And what provision in the way of nursing is made for these? At the very utmost (except in two or three of the very largest establishments) but one paid nurse is to be found, in many not one (as in a fourth of those in London); and the work is undertaken by the pauper women, who may be supposed to possess about that knowledge of nursing which every woman acquires by common experience or intuition.

'In one workhouse the nurse and the helper in a sick ward containing above twenty patients were both intoxicated more or less on the same day; and on another occasion when the matron left the ward, ordering one of them to sit up with a dying patient just sent out of a hospital, both went to bed directly the matron vanished, and left the sufferer to the care of another patient who was just able to crawl from her bed to assist her. Visit where you will, ask whom you will, matrons kind, or harsh, or indifferent, all will tell you the same story, that the nurses drink whenever they have the opportunity; and yet the vice, which of all others is thought the most objectionable, the most utterly intolerable in a private household of servants in whatever rank of society it may be, is tolerated or ignored in these public and national institutions throughout the land!

'So vast a machinery can only be organized and supported by national and public funds, and why should we wish it otherwise? What nobler task can be undertaken by a country than that all should contribute in their measure to maintain its helpless and its suffering members? It is only when the cold, hard machinery comes *alone*, when it is separated from all charity, human and divine, all sympathy, all personal intercourse between class and class, that it becomes so mischievous, so perverted in its workings. And truly it revenges itself upon *us*, the more fortunate members of the community, who help to make it what it is. All the lost and neglected and degraded girls who haunt our streets or fill our penitentiaries and prisons, cost over again ten times the sum of their maintenance in workhouses, and yet women's help and protection might have arrested their downward course from the school in which they were brought up. We have all heard such help rejected in such terms as "interference," "injudicious meddling," "innovation," and such like; but who has

ever counted up the failures, the losses, the errors which the sole management of men in Boards of Guardians has incurred ?'

Now, here is the work to be done. Professor Burrows seems to believe there are women enough ready to do it. We cannot doubt that there are enough willing and able to make a deep impression upon its mass; and a well-devised machinery meeting a grave social want in such a society as ours always draws rapidly around it a commensurate agency. The more work there is to be done, the more, generally speaking, there are of volunteers ready to do it. We think that no individual, were the responsibility his own, would dare to refuse the experiment; but when we come to Boards and local self-government the case is widely different. No doubt eager and zealous ladies will knock at the workhouse door some time before 'the Board' turns the key to admit them.

Mr. Lawrell read a paper of interest noways inferior to either of the foregoing on 'Young Men's Institutes.' The great point which his experience seemed to establish was, that a vital principle, such as Church-membership, boldly asserted and carried out to be a bond of such a society, holds it firmly knit together; whilst bodies with other less out-spoken and less determined ties of union are feebly cohesive and faintly attractive. One deponent whom he quotes, says:—

'I consider that the chief cause of the Society's success is its being *exclusively a Church Society*. A similar institution in the town, whose members may belong to any religious persuasion whatever, is by no means as flourishing as ours.'

Of another Society somewhat similar in its objects, but unlike in this respect, that it had not the backbone which supported the other, he states:—

'The Society was to be so *carefully* constituted as "to avoid all extremes," and you know what generally happens to such societies. They lead a brief timid life, "shivering and shuddering," and die a scarcely premature death. They are afraid of doing anything, and so do nothing.'

This is a refreshing fact in the history of our age. It is highly questionable whether thirty, or even fifteen years ago, the same experiments could have been made with the same results. We think it highly probable that *then*, the zeal of the few who might have felt strongly interested in a Society, taking up a spiritual stand-point, would have proved a practical difficulty, as zeal is wont to do when, amongst the same social organization, it exists in a high degree in a small number, and in the rest, feebly or not at all. We take the fact of its rallying recruits now, whom it might once have dissipated, as a gauge of the diffusion of zeal in spiritual things more uniformly among the social body. This, be it remembered, is a critical class among whom to make the attempt; if the fact we describe is

true among young men, prematurely, in some sense, their own masters, with the power of choice which London opens, and the tendency to take full licence which their age and station suggest, we think it is likely to be generally true in society at large.

Mr. Lawrell sketches a typical group of various associations, some for literary and musical purposes; some for social intercourse and mutual improvement; some for work more strictly subservient to the needs and uses of the Church; but all framed in a spirit of loyalty to her teaching and consciousness of the privileges she has in trust. One is for mere youths between fourteen and eighteen. Its site is in the Lowther Arcade; its treasurer we take to be a London tradesman; its object is to promote both studies and amusements, and to afford the greatest possible liberty to its members in their choice of either.

The following hints seem to be very judicious, as regards the projection of any such societies:—

‘Have as few rules as possible at first, and let these few be provisional; as necessities arise, let them expand themselves: thus the rules will be formed on general experience; will not be “cut and dried” beforehand, and need not be merely personal to suit any particular case. Having got a set of rules, let there be a practical, and, as far as possible, a *wise* governing body, aiming at the mean between the autocracy of a single founder, and the oligarchy of a set or clique in a town or parish.’

On the whole, when we weigh the disadvantages which beset any meeting of a general character this year, or at this particular period of any year, there are solid grounds for congratulation on the comparative success which the Congress met with. Not only was there unusual attraction in London, which probably drew off many of the leaders of the University, at a time when they were just enjoying a release from the labours of the term; but the Congress at Cambridge, nominally of the previous year, really fell considerably within the twelvemonths’ period, in which its instauration at the sister University occurred. The fact that Parliament was also sitting, though it served to enliven the Congress at one particular sitting with important news from the arena of legislative strife upon Church Rates, yet served necessarily to detain many in town who might otherwise have attended, and to make the attendance of others casual and occasional only. These and other topics of the same kind were pointed out in a letter in the *Guardian* of July 16, by A. J. B. B. H. The critical state of the cotton manufacturing districts should also be taken into account in the estimate of competing topics and distracting interests. There were about 900 tickets sold, of which about 100 were purchased by ladies, showing a large increase over the numbers at Cambridge barely eight months previous. There was, however, a larger proportion

of laymen at the Cambridge Congress, arising no doubt in a great degree from the fact of the University term being then in course, which would give all the resident members of the University who had graduated, but were not yet ordained, and probably many undergraduates also, an opportunity of attending. The share taken by the laity in the debates at Oxford will, however, bear fair comparison with that at Cambridge. As regards the representation of parties, there is the best authority for asserting, that all that could be done was done, to ensure to all the amplest opportunity of being fairly represented. Mr. Medd, one of the Secretaries, writing in the *Guardian*, July 30, says on the subject of alleged unequal representation:—

‘It was this kind of thing that Congress Committee wished especially and before all things to avoid, and hoped that by the following measures they had avoided:—

‘1. By sowing their circular of invitation broadcast over the whole Church, including all the dignified clergy, and others, not occurring in official lists, whom they knew to be prominently active in ministerial work, of whatever school.

‘2. By publicly advertised invitations to the whole body of the Church.

‘3. By especially inviting the attendance of laymen.’

He further states, that in forming the Committee ‘all the ‘Heads of Houses, all the Canons of Christ Church, all the ‘Divinity Professors, and all the parochial Incumbents of ‘Oxford,’ with other prominent members ‘of the Clergy and ‘laity of whatever shade of opinion,’ received invitations to join it, and adds, ‘why some few of those included in the above ‘category refused to join us is best known to themselves.’ As regards the somewhat testy complaints of a writer in the same paper of July 23, we can only point out that the most efficient check on any want of Christian courtesy manifested in the papers read, or statements made, at the Congress, would be the rising to challenge them at the time, for which every facility was afforded, and not the sending complaints to newspapers afterwards. As the complainant ‘desires to be a member of the Congress in future years,’ we hope this hint may be of use to him. Let him speak out like a man on behalf of any cause which he may think injured or ignored, not shoot an anonymous arrow into a battle-field from whence the combatants have decamped. No complaint, if fair, can be duly redressed, or if frivolous, properly exposed, when all is over. The man who ‘will not when he may’ is *ipso facto* out of court; and it is worse than a want of courtesy to sow a controversy of uncertain issue when a word in season might have saved the need of a letter afterwards. The scene will shift to Manchester next year, and some supporters of opinions which found little favour

at Oxford or Cambridge, may find a field of sympathy and a locally convenient opportunity of attending there. Let us hope that free speech and impartial hearing will be the rule for all, and that we may have none of these grumbings through the key-hole by those who waited till the door was shut. It cannot but be natural that each meeting, however praiseworthy the efforts to make it colourless, should contract something of local colouring. A meeting at a great northern manufacturing city cannot be the mere refracted image of that at an university. The blue rays of the spectrum have, perhaps, predominated here; there the compensative tint may utter itself, and the balance of luminosity be the better preserved. To unfurl the Church's colour at Manchester will be to plant the standard within the enemy's lines. A successful meeting there will win her great adherence among the men of peace and thrift who watch the turning tide and like to roll with it. A meeting weak and without heart, or without brotherly concord and union, strong merely for strife, would be worse than none. It would leave the Church in the ditch and her enemies once more upon the bank. Yet the fact of a Congress being proclaimed, and discussion invited, of course, is plain proof that minds are not made up, and that opinions may differ. Some regard the debate of a Dean and Chapter over a *congé d'élire*, as the perfect model of an edifying discussion in the Church. They cannot take in the fact that where mighty principles and momentous interests are making their weight felt, there human judgments must sometimes clash in their estimate of them. Nay, men's mere temperaments, apart alike from their principles and their interests, will often array them on opposite sides of a practical question. For the eager will be crying 'forward,' while the wary will be crying 'hold.' The bolder sort will be eager to do and to dare, the more patient willing to endure. And in this world, aye, and in the Church amidst the world, it is not always the eager who are wrong and the wary who are right, but the policy of Camillus has its turn with that of Fabius. The greatest token that the Congress is doing an important work which we have yet observed is that the *Times* has now begun to decry it. It is a sure portent of the enlarged aspect and prominence of any public body or proceeding, when Momus begins flinging sarcasms. This is a prelude eventually to the paper bolt of the Thunderer himself. Decius and Diocletian have passed away, and there is nothing left but the *Times*, and the rest of the gang whom it leads, to purify our silver. 'There are ways,' quoth the *Times*, 'of doing things, and there are ways of not doing them; and wise men find out that Church Congresses belong to the latter.' It is hardly worth while to

point out that to know how is one way of not merely 'doing things,' but of doing them well; and that the sifting out of such knowledge for the use of those who will learn of it is a practical step of great importance. Let us hope for a Congress at Manchester, full and grave, and well frequented, a Congress which will set the *Times* sneering for a week, a Congress which will open some questions and ripen others, and perhaps set some at rest. The object of these meetings is not to continue an adjourned debate from year to year, but rather to act from the weight of present circumstances and the pressure of whatever want is strongest at the moment. They will habituate men to think with a view of influencing others and not merely guiding themselves. The various Church Societies should each be careful to have representatives ready, and each should come primed thoroughly on whatever subject local experience may give the fullest light. The question, will the Bishop of Manchester consent to preside, is one which we cannot answer. He may not be equal to his brother of Oxford, whom the eyes of hundreds marked and admired—

'*Torrentem et pleni moderantem frena theatri*'—

in capacity and experience, possibly still less a match in temper and tact. But the post would be vastly more difficult for any one else to fill than for him, even were he least gifted in these respects of the whole episcopal bench. The heartiness with which the Congress movement is endorsed among the Manchester clergy, will do more to ensure the presence of the right man in the chair than any exhortations of ours. We hope that they will not yield to the shallow indifferentism which lets occasion pass and makes no sign of 'taking it by the hand,' but by their strenuous backing bring their bishop to the front. Once in the chair, it will be open to him still to perform the part of a figure-head or of a steersman. Chairmen are constantly chosen for their efficiency in this or in that capacity, but we do not think there is any danger of the Bishop of Manchester's preferring the part of the wooden effigy.

The regulations as regards reading or speaking proved their entire wisdom. The President, chronometer in hand, called 'time' with unfailing punctuality. A good-humoured gentleman, whom we will not name, but who was obviously shortsighted, continued on one occasion addressing the audience in glowing periods for some minutes over the appointed twenty, and as it drew towards that limit, was observed most unconsciously to drop his eye-glass and continue speaking, so that he saw no more of the President's signal of admonition than Nelson at Copenhagen with his blind eye to the telescope.

Roused at last by an under-current of laughter, amid the deserved cheers which waited on his peroration, he discovered his situation, and 'feared he had somewhat trespassed' on the law of time, when the laugh became loud and hearty. Occasionally, by common consent, an unusually interesting reader or speaker was allowed to turn the hour-glass over, but we think the precedent a dangerous one. The chairman here has a difficult task. He cannot well oppose the loudly expressed feeling of the meeting. He cannot yield to it without infringing on the time for discussion, always scanty with the best management in precise proportion as the subject is interesting, and the audience interested. Here then we think the Committee might reasonably make a stand, or the secretaries interpose the tribunitia veto. They would act as a barrier between the President and the pressure of enthusiasm from below; and, certainly, the object of the Congress being, as it is said on the authority of the late President to be, 'to discuss everything and decide nothing,' that object is most likely to be furthered by the greatest amount of talk from the greatest number.

On the whole we look forward to the Congress at Manchester with the greatest hopes, but with some apprehensions. The city, where a Cathedral has been newly planted among chimney-stalks, is now on her trial. The bustling energies of the democratic north-west may infuse a ruder spirit into debate, and lay a rougher hand on delicate questions, than conduces to their calm elucidation. But those who think that Church reforms are made with rose-water, will find that matters have gone too far for the otiose sereneness which 'lets' all things 'slide.' The pinch of industrial affliction will bring home to many minds the solemn truth that there are laws above those of political economy, and needs in human nature which cannot be left to the mere operation of supply and demand. Even the dreary truce imposed on commerce, by the failure of the world's great fibre, the silent looms and smokeless chimneys, will have taught a wholesome lesson, if the pause be even partially filled by the discussion of the foremost Christian interests, and the turn of human thought-currents to man's unearthly wants.

NOTICES.

We cordially recommend to the notice of our readers Mr. Karlake's 'Exposition of the Lord's Prayer' (J. H. and J. Parker), of which we had intended to speak more particularly in our last number in the article on the 'Early Literature of the Lord's Prayer.' It is, we think, the most complete, clear, and systematic treatise on the subject that has yet appeared. Most complete it naturally is, having evidently been written after a careful study of all the chief writers on the Prayer both of early and modern times. But the various materials collected for the work and incorporated into it have been so carefully digested by the writer's own mind, that the exposition is quite clear and orderly throughout. Many of the finest passages from other writers collected by the author are placed in the notes, which thus form in themselves a storehouse of beautiful extracts, which well repay perusal, gathered as they are from the chief writers on the Prayer, foreign as well as English. At the same time they bring out into greater fulness ideas that have been given very briefly, in such a way as not to break the thread of the argument, in the lectures themselves. Knowing how little even educated people understand the full meaning of this most beautiful prayer, given by our Lord Himself as the form in which we should address God, we should wish this commentary upon it to be in the hands of all, and more especially of preachers. We would suggest that the extracts from writers on the Prayer, which are now given in the appendix to the book, might well be put into a separate volume, and a more complete catena of extracts given, according to the plan which the author states he had originally formed, but gave up in order to avoid extending the work to greater length.

We ought before now to have called attention to Vapereau's 'Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains' (Paris: Hachette), which has already reached a second edition. It is the best work of that nature we are acquainted with, and incomparably superior to 'Men of the Time,' 'Rank and Talent of the Time,' and similar works published in England. Like French publications of that character, it is full, elaborate, comprehensive, and contains a vast amount of useful information. Like most French publications also—especially when treating of Englishmen and of the English Church—it, however, also contains information which, though curious, is not so useful, and might be easily dispensed with. Under the name of Dr. Pusey, for instance, we read: '*Unanimes dans l'attaque de la constitution de ce qu'on appelle en Angleterre la haute Eglise, le docteur Pusey et ses adhérents, s'affranchissant de la tutelle de l'Etat, séparaient le spirituel du temporel, et, remontant par delà la réforme du xvi^e siècle, prétendaient se rattacher à l'Eglise apostolique; leur maxime "point de salut dans une Eglise sans traditions et asservie à l'Etat" impliquait*

'*un retour prochain aux dogmes et à la discipline du catholicisme. A cette nécessité de renouer la chaîne des temps, les nouveaux sectaires ajoutèrent toute une suite de mesures de restauration : la lecture de la Bible retirée aux laïques ; la consécration épiscopale et l'ordination sacerdotale réservées aux seuls évêques* [what a novelty !]; les sacrements et les prières déclarés parties essentielles du culte (!), la messe rétablie, avec la pénitence et la confession auriculaire, l'efficacité absolue de la grâce, la croyance au purgatoire.' This is a sad jumble; but it is not all. Having stated that the Bishop of Oxford prohibited the continuation of the 'Tracts for the Times,' M. Vapereau adds: 'Cette mesure n'arrêta pas le zèle des dissidents . . . loin de retracter aucune de leurs propositions, ils préconisèrent l'invocation des saints, le culte de Marie, le célibat des prêtres, l'organisation monacale, la liturgie romaine.' As to poor Dr. Pusey, 'qui allait, en 1843, jusqu'à prêcher en faveur du dogme de la transsubstantiation, il fut accusé d'hérésie et traduit devant une commission spéciale, et l'usage de la chaire lui fut interdit pendant deux ans. A peu de temps de là, soit qu'il fût effrayé des conséquences logiques de ses doctrines, soit qu'il répugnât à suivre ses disciples dans l'abjuration formelle du protestantisme, il écrivit à l'évêque de Londres une lettre dans laquelle il cherchait à se justifier de ses erreurs passées.' We once heard an intelligent Frenchman declare that the Archbishop of Canterbury enjoyed an income of five millions of francs, and, what is more, we had great difficulty in persuading him such was not the case. M. Vapereau does not assert quite so much, but he goes some way towards it. Under the name of 'John Bird Sumner,' after being informed that the late Archbishop was a 'Liberal in politics,' we are told:—'On évalue les revenus actuels du primat à 62,000 liv. st. (environ 1,500,000 fr.)' Of the Dean of Chichester we read:—'Desservant dans l'île de Wight, puis professeur au Collège Saint-Philippe de Birmingham (1827), il fut nommé, en 1829, vicaire (curé) à Coventry, et quitta cette paroisse en 1837 pour administrer celle de Leeds, qui est une des plus peuplées de l'Angleterre. Actif et dévoué, il y a fait construire, en dix-sept ans, à l'aide de souscriptions volontaires, dix-sept églises nouvelles, et réparer entièrement la cathédrale, qui a coûté plus de 700,000 francs. . . . Il a écrit de nombreux livres de piété qui ont eu un grand écoulement. Bien qu'il ait été soupçonné de pencher vers les doctrines séparatistes après le sermon qu'il prononça devant la cour en 1838, il a repris faveur, et c'est un des auteurs en vogue de l'Eglise officielle.' Again, Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh, is called a 'prêtre écossais,' while Mr. Keble is simply a 'ministre.' The biographies of foreigners seem very full and exact; those of Englishmen are frequently very meagre. Indeed, we notice several eminent Englishmen—such, for instance, as the Bishop of Exeter and Canon Wordsworth—of whom no account whatever is given. On the other hand, we have some two dozen lines devoted to Mr. Holyoake, the secularist, who is styled a 'théologien anglais!' We trust that M. Vapereau will, in the next edition of his really valuable work, correct such blunders and rectify such deficiencies as we have pointed out, and of which the list could easily be extended.

Not only the 'Little Ones,' to whom the work is inscribed, but also

